

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 2s.; Country, 2s.; with the WEEKLY REPORT, 5s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JUNE 30, 1877.

### CURRENT TOPICS.

YESTERDAY Lord Justice James announced the following arrangements for the business of the Court of Appeal during the remainder of the present sittings:—The court will sit in Lincoln's-inn till the end of the sittings. The appeals from the Chancery Division will be taken as the ordinary business of the court. The bankruptcy appeals being somewhat in arrear, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday in next week will be devoted to them. Arrangements will be made for disposing of the appeals from the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division. If there are any appeals from the common law divisions which the parties desire to have heard before the long vacation they must make application to the court for the purpose. The common law appeal motions will be taken with the other appeal motions on Wednesdays.

THE RECENT NEWS FROM THE EAST contains some serious complaints as to violations of international law. First, there are mutual charges as to firing on hospitals and other buildings. The Russian batteries near Giurgevo and the Turkish batteries at Rustchuk are on opposite sides of the Danube. A telegram from the *Times* correspondent at Giurgevo, dated June 23, complains that on that day the Turkish batteries had bombarded the town of Giurgevo, and hit fifteen times (more often than any other building except one) the new hospital there, which had the Red Cross flying conspicuously over it. Other telegrams from the *Times* correspondent at Rustchuk, state that on the following day, the 24th, the Russian batteries near Giurgevo (besides firing on the shipping and batteries on the Turkish side of the river) for a time "concentrated their fire upon Rustchuk, where considerable damage was done. The English consulate was destroyed, while the French and German consulates, the Konak, and several hospitals were much damaged," and it is added that "the consuls are drawing up a protest against the conduct of the Russians as being against all principles of international law."

With regard to hospitals and other public buildings, the protocol of Brussels Conference, which the Russians have pledged themselves to follow, lays down (article 17) that in a bombardment "all necessary steps should be taken to spare, as far as possible, buildings devoted to religion, arts, sciences, and charity, hospitals and places where sick and wounded are collected, on condition that they are not used at the same time for military purposes. It is the duty of the besieged to indicate these buildings by special visible signs, to be notified beforehand by the besieged." It does not yet appear whether the hospitals and other buildings entitled to protection under this article had been indicated by visible signs whose meaning was made known to the Russians. If they were, the fact (if it be a fact) that the Turks had fired on a Red Cross hospital on the previous day would

not justify the Russians in following their example. Of course neither this nor any other rule for mitigating the horrors of war can be treated as binding on one belligerent if the other side persists in disregarding it; but surely a rule established in the interests of humanity ought not to be considered as abrogated until, by the failure of all remonstrances and demands for explanation, this is made quite clear.

The firing on the consulates seems to be generally regarded as a serious violation of international law, especially as the English consul's flag is said to have been flying, but we have not yet been able to find any foundation for this view. Nothing was said about any such right at the Brussels Conference, nor in the American Articles of War of 1863, nor was any such right, so far as we can remember, claimed during the siege of Paris, though several ambassadors and *chargés d'affaires* remained for some time in the besieged city.

Besides this, the Ottoman Government have formally complained of the Russians having blown up three Turkish merchant vessels, so that a great part of the crews perished. If this be true, it is a very serious violation of international law. From Odessa we learn that after the Russians had captured two Turkish ships, as they could not be towed in to Odessa, the crews were taken on board, and the vessels sunk. This may, perhaps, turn out to be a more correct version of the same transaction, or it may relate to different ships, but, however this may be, it is desirable to point out that to capture even an enemy's ship and destroy it before it has been condemned by a court of admiralty is not allowed by international law, unless in cases of very urgent necessity (see *The Action*, 2 Dods. 48; *The Felicity*, 2 Dods. 381).

IN EARLY TIME it seems to have been held that the jurisdiction to punish for obscene libels was in the ecclesiastical courts, and it was not until the reign of George II. that it was settled in *R. v. Curi* (2 Str. 789) that the temporal courts had jurisdiction in such matters. The whole ancient learning of the question may be found in that case. It seems that in *R. v. Read* [temp. Anne] (Fort. 98) there had been an information for a libel in writing an obscene book, amounting to a "general solicitation of chastity," and after conviction it was moved in arrest of judgment that this was not punishable in the temporal courts; and the opinion of Chief Justice Holt was so strong with the objection "that the prosecutor never thought fit to stir it again." Fortescue, J., was inclined to give way to the authority of this case, but, he being afterwards replaced by Page, J., the court, after taking time to consider, "gave it as their unanimous opinion that this was a temporal offence." The case having occurred before Fox's Act, it is probable that the verdict of guilty was found upon the issue of publication only. As for the punishment, the reporter, by whom the case "was to have been spoke to," states, with some little unprofessional animus, that "the defendant was afterwards set in the pillory as he well deserved." In *R. v. Wilkes* (4 Burr. 2527) the defendant was convicted of publishing an obscene libel, but the objection to the jurisdiction of the court was not taken, probably because the libel was also blasphemous, and as such undoubtedly indictable. The question whether an obscene publication is indictable *per se* does not seem to have arisen in any other cases, but more than one case recognizes the correctness of *R. v. Curi* indirectly. Thus in *R. v. Mary Carlile* (3 B. & Ald. 167), and more recently in *Steel v. Brannan* (20 W. R. 607), it was decided that the privilege given by law to reports of judicial proceedings does not extend to publications which contain matters of an obscene and demoralizing character. The offence was a common law misdemeanour, and punishable as such only, until it was enacted by 14 & 15 Vict. c. 100, s. 29, that "whenever

any person shall be convicted of any public selling or exposing for public sale . . . of any obscene book . . . it shall be lawful for the court to sentence the offender to be imprisoned for any term now warranted by law, and also to be kept to hard labour during the whole or any part of such term of imprisonment." Lord Campbell's Act (20 & 21 Vict. c. 83) (under which, be it observed, the prosecution in the recent case did not proceed) did not create any new offence, but merely substituted the summary process of the seizure of the book by justices for the more cumbersome one of the indictment of the offender. This Act provides that justices of the peace may order the seizure and destruction of "any obscene books" kept "for the purpose of sale or distribution, exhibition for purposes of gain, lending upon hire, or being otherwise published for purposes of gain." But in order to authorize such a seizure, the justices must be satisfied that the books, &c., "are of such a character and description that the publication of them could be a misdemeanour, and proper to be prosecuted as such." We can find no case of an indictment where the *bona fides* of the defendants has been in question, but in the case of *Reg. v. Hicklin* (L.R. 3 Q.B. 373), decided on Lord Campbell's Act, the defendant sold at cost price, and from an honest motive, a pamphlet called the "Confessional Unmasked," showing "the depravity of the Romish priesthood and the questions put to females in confession." Part of this work was controversial, part, consisting of extracts (translated) from Liguori and other writers, contained, said Cockburn, C.J., "a series of paragraphs, one following upon another, each involving some impure practices, some of them of the most filthy and disgusting and unnatural description it is possible to imagine." The Court of Queen's Bench (Cockburn, C.J., and Blackburn, Mellor, and Lush, J.J.) held that the pamphlet came within the Act, and laid down the rules (1) that an obscene publication was such a publication as "tended to corrupt the mind and morals of those into whose hands it might come"; and (2) that it does not lie in the mouth of one who sold such a publication to say that he did it for some wholesome or salutary purpose. Mellor, J., however, concurred with hesitation on the first point, remarking that "the nature of the subject itself, if it might be discussed at all—and he thought it undoubtedly might—was such that it could not be discussed without producing authorities for the assertion that the confessional would be a mischievous thing to be introduced into this kingdom; so that it appeared to be very much a question of degree."

IT IS A LITTLE SURPRISING that, while questions are asked in Parliament with reference to the Surrey Assizes, no one should think of raising afresh a question of much wider concern with reference to the sittings in London. Under the old system the courts sat at Guildhall up to about the 8th of July; under the new system the summer circuits commence on the 27th of June. Several days' sittings of the courts are lost to the public by the new arrangements, and learned judges, with the prospect of nearly three months' holiday, do not hesitate to deprive suitors in the City of the inestimable advantage of the prolonged sittings. And this is done on the flimsiest plea which was surely ever invented. Ord. 61, r. 2, provides that "the long vacation shall commence on the 10th of August," and the learned judges informed Mr. Cross last year, and Mr. Cross informed the House of Commons, that the judges of the common law divisions had come to the conclusion that, having regard to this provision, "it would not be proper" that they should sit after the 10th of August. As if an Order in Council could not be made under section 27 of the Judicature Act, 1873, on the recommendation of the judges, extending the period for sitting on circuit!

APROPOS OF THE REMARKS in our last week's issue respecting illegible writing in pleadings, it may be desirable to suggest that writs also should be legibly written. In many cases which have come under our notice, the writing in writs has been decipherable only with great difficulty, and if the copies presented for sealing and filing have been in like condition we can only say that we pity the officials charged with the duty of examining them. It would really seem that, where a printed or lithographed form is to be used, the fact that it is only a form is regarded as sufficiently justifying the filling it up in a dashing, offhand, careless style. It should not be forgotten, however, that cases may arise in which a judge may desire to inspect and read a writ—the copy filed, for instance—as well as a pleading, and we would express the hope that, whenever that shall happen, the copy handed to the judge may be easily readable. The truth is that illegible writing in public and official documents, and, we may add, in signatures thereto, is not simply an inconvenience—it inflicts a most undue and injurious strain upon the eye of the reader, and greatly interferes with and obstructs the prompt despatch of business.

#### INTENT AND MOTIVE AS BEARING ON OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS.

THE questions relating to "malice," "intention," "motive," and similar matters as ingredients of crime, which arise from time to time in the course of judicial proceedings, are of great interest, as being on the borderland between law and mental and moral philosophy. Our law does not, for the most part, treat these questions in a very comprehensive or philosophical manner. It is contented to deal with them in a hand-to-mouth kind of way, confining its attention very much to their treatment in relation to the particular matter, and not endeavouring to group such questions together, and treat them from a broader and more scientific point of view. It is difficult to say how far it would be desirable or profitable that judges, in their official declarations of the law, should commit themselves to speculations trenching too closely upon metaphysics or psychology; but it seems to us both desirable and profitable that these questions should be discussed by legal writers in a more comprehensive and theoretical manner than can be adopted in actual practice. The theory which, more or less distinctly apprehended, is the basis of our views about a subject will always affect the practical treatment of it in the concrete, even though not explicitly referred to. The recent case of *The Queen v. Bradlaugh* illustrated a good many of the confusions of idea prevalent upon the subject of what constitutes criminal intent. It is observable, in reading the arguments employed by the defendants, how easily ideas essentially distinct, though similar, become merged in one another in the course of dealing with topics of the nature of those upon which the defence rested, and so confusion and fallacies are produced. A great part of the argument for the defence may be fairly summed up as based on the proposition that, in order to constitute a crime, a wicked intent must exist. We have used these words advisedly because they seem to us very fairly to illustrate the amount of confusion of idea that may exist in what to an ordinary person would seem a tolerably plain expression, and they likewise fairly illustrate the particular fallacies of some part of the line of defence pursued.

"Wicked intent" may mean intent to do an act that the doer thinks wicked, or that others think wicked. It is by reason of the natural tendency to slip about from one of these meanings to the other, and also sometimes by skilful designed interchange of them, that the difficulty in dealing with such a matter as that which was involved in *The Queen v. Bradlaugh* arises. The suggestion that was contained in a great deal of what was

urged by the defendants was that, to constitute the offence charged against them, it was necessary that they should have intended to do an act apprehended by them as wicked. It seems to us that the existence of a criminal law is certainly based on the other meaning which we have given to the words "wicked intent," and with regard to more ordinary and definite offences this would hardly be disputed. The law does not deal with the individual conscience. Society must in the nature of things proceed on the footing that what is right and wrong does not depend on individual opinion, and that a man must be concluded, for the purposes of determining what actions society shall restrain him from doing, by the general opinion of the community of which he forms a part.

It is no doubt true that false opinions have prevailed, and may now prevail, as to what is right and wrong in society, and the man who is a criminal in one age may become a martyr in another. This is, however, altogether immaterial to the legal question. In some cases society through the law has defined the particular acts that may not be done, as in the case of murder, forgery, &c., and then the only question for the jury is whether such acts have been committed; in other cases the law can only forbid classes of acts included under general descriptions, and then it is for the common feeling of mankind, as represented by the verdict of the jury, to say whether the particular act falls within the description. No criminal law, and, in fact, no organized society, would be possible if it were to be allowed that right and wrong should be matters of individual opinion. These remarks, as applied to the more ordinary cases, such as homicide, larceny, and so forth, appear to be truisms when the question comes to be stated distinctly, but men are very apt to drift back in the discussion of the concrete to fallacies which in the abstract they have repudiated, and it is clear to us, from our observation of the comments made upon the case of Mr. Bradlaugh, that in such a case as that of the question whether there has been a publication of an obscene book the public are very far from clearly remembering the distinction we have referred to.

A more difficult question than that to which we have just adverted is the question of motive in relation to the more undefined class of offences. It is no doubt true that, granted an action in its nature criminal, motive is, in the eye of the law, altogether irrelevant, but there may be cases in which it is not easy to disentangle the question of motive from the question of crime or no crime. It is very easy to say that a person is not justified in committing a crime because some ultimate good object is aimed at, and there are some cases which are easily disposed of by this obvious proposition. The case of *Reg. v. Hicklin* (L. R. 3 Q. B. 360) was one of these cases. It being sufficiently ascertained that the book called the "Confessional Unmasked" was a grossly indecent book, it did not, under the particular circumstances of the case, take very much consideration to show that the fact that by its publication it was intended to call public attention to, and so prevent, certain alleged immoralities of the Romish system was no justification. The same proposition may, perhaps, be applied as true in the abstract to all cases, but in many it may be urged that it affords a very uncertain test, because in dealing with topics that are so much a question of occasion and degree as the question whether a publication is or is not immoral, the question of motive often must become an element in determining the original question of crime or no crime. The word "motive," however, though commonly used in relation to this topic, is, perhaps, incorrect as involving a similar fallacy to that implied in the term "wicked intent." Strictly speaking the motive is probably wholly immaterial, but what persons often really mean by this term is the ultimate and indirect effect of an action as opposed to its direct result. This, we think, must be

It appears to us, we must say, that as an abstract proposition the canon that whoever publishes that which has a tendency to degrade or corrupt the minds of society is guilty of the publication of an obscene work in the criminal sense, is too broad if intended to exclude the ultimate and indirect effect of the publication, though in practice, and accompanied by the collateral observations which judges are in the habit of making, it may not mislead juries. We cannot help thinking if any one considers the matter carefully, with a due regard to the strictly accurate use of language, that the question of the ultimate effect of publication must often come in, and the real question must in many cases be, not merely whether the publication has a tendency to corrupt, but whether it was justified by the occasion. We cannot suggest a closer test than the question whether the publication was, on the whole, really in the interests of public morality or against them. The idea of decency is based on this principle:—Man is a creature whose morality and happiness depend on an equilibrium of faculties and energies under the control of reason. There are certain animal energies and tendencies which are disposed, if unrestrained, to exercise an overmastering influence and lower the character of the whole being. The sight of certain representations and the suggestion of certain ideas are calculated to excite these animal energies and produce the mischief to be avoided, and therefore society has by experience been led to veil and put out of sight certain facts and topics. It is difficult to say on principle that any reference to such facts and topics has not some tendency to corrupt, just as every morsel of extraneous matter put into a stream has a tendency to pollute. But the facts that society has agreed to treat with reserve are after all facts of nature, and for some purposes and to some extent must be recognized. The publication by Lord Redesdale in the House of Lords of certain details with regard to the "Priest in Absolution" would have, we should suppose, some tendency to corrupt some people. We should not wonder, if the work were procurable at any bookseller's, that the sale would have gone up considerably after the debate. But no sensible person would suggest that Lord Redesdale was guilty of obscenity in bringing this topic forward, for the simple reason that most people will be of opinion that the mischief that otherwise might have resulted would have been greater, and that the speaker did not, in dealing with the subject, publish anything that was unnecessary having regard to the object which he had in view. Unless, therefore, you include in the idea of corrupting the public morals the idea of a certain overplus of corrupting tendency as compared with the necessity of the occasion or other qualifying notions, the legal definition of obscenity above referred to is incorrect as a practical test, and if you do so qualify its meaning, it is incorrect as an expression of abstract doctrine.

It seems to us that a good deal in the arguments and judgment in *Reg. v. Hicklin* illustrates what we have said, both as to the fallacies current with regard to the necessity of a wicked intent and as to the question of motive or more strictly ultimate effect, as an ingredient. The decision of *The Queen v. Hicklin* was perfectly right in so far as it rejected the question *quo animo* the publication was made, but if it is to be considered as a decision that there never can be a justification for the publication of that which directly tends to corrupt, we regard it as wrong. It seems to us you must look to a balance of interest in dealing with the question. If a publication, though to some extent indecent, in the sense that it deals with topics as to which the general rule is that there should be silence or extreme reserve, nevertheless tends to prevent a greater immorality or evil, it seems to us not obscene. In *The Queen v. Hicklin* it was obvious that on a balance of direct disadvantage to morality and ultimate advantage, the conviction was right.

## Reviews.

## EQUITY.

THE PRINCIPLES OF EQUITY. By T. A. ROBERTS, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. Third Edition. London : Butterworths.

This book has some superficial eccentricities which prejudice the reader unfavourably. For the sake, we presume, of saving space, the references to text-books are often by unfamiliar initials, which call for an independent reference to the list of authorities, and cases are generally cited, not by their names, but only by the page of the report. The construction of the sentences is inelegant even beyond the proverbial inelegance of lawyers. This disregard of mere form would suggest that the book was intended more for practitioners' use than for a student's text-book. We cannot say that it is well adapted for either purpose; although most practitioners would find in it much that they imperfectly know, and students would find much rudimentary learning. By studious compression the author has contrived to introduce into no means a large book a surprising amount of matter; but from the necessity of things he has touched but slightly on many of the subject he refers to. All that he can find space for, for instance, on the subject of the mode of ascertaining domicil (so far as we have discovered) is this:—"It is frequently very difficult to ascertain what is the deceased's domicil, whether that of origin or an acquired one, and the cases on the subject are very numerous." Then follows a string of references. We are told something about delay and a good deal about specific performance; but, so far as we have observed, the special materiality of delay on the plaintiff's part in cases of specific performance is not referred to. Is there any good authority for the suggestion (p. 369) that an injunction would be granted against obstruction of the access of air to a windmill because the mill would thereby be rendered useless?

The Inns of Court Volunteers' ball was held at Lincoln's-inn on Wednesday. The fair and learned visitors numbered about 1,500, and general satisfaction was expressed at the completeness of the arrangements and decorations.

Last week a communication relating to a change in the members of a legal partnership was inserted in the advertisement columns of this journal. We need hardly say that this was due to a pure oversight in the publishing department, and was not intended or desired either by the legal firm referred to or by the publisher of the JOURNAL who has invariably refused to receive any advertisement of this kind.

On Wednesday, at the Central Criminal Court, Leonard Laidman, who pleaded "guilty" last sessions to an indictment charging him with embezzlements amounting in the aggregate to £12,000 or £13,000, came up for judgment. Mr. Grin appeared on behalf of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, in whose employ the prisoner was as a confidential clerk, to prosecute; Mr. Besley and Mr. Horace Avery defended. Mr. Besley urged that the prisoner's defalcations were due to that "demon speculation," and not to any dishonest motive with a view to gratifying his own vices. The Recorder said the prisoner had pleaded guilty to a systematic course of robbery, and, considering his position in the institution and the magnitude of the fraud, his offence was a most serious one. Mr. Besley had said that the defalcations were due to that "demon speculation," but probably that "demon speculation" was in nineteen cases out of twenty the moving cause. He could not treat this as an ordinary fraud, and he should not be discharging his duty to the public unless he sentenced the prisoner to five years' penal servitude.

## Cases of the Week.

POWER OF COURT OF APPEAL—ALTERATION OF DECREE IN FAVOUR OF RESPONDENT WHO HAS NOT APPEALED—ORD. 58, RR. 5, 6.—A case of *Kavan v. Crawford*, decided by the Court of Appeal on the 22nd inst., affords an illustration of the extent of the powers of that court under the present practice. The suit was instituted in the Lancaster Chancery Court by the trustee of a bankrupt to set aside an ante-nuptial settlement made by the bankrupt for the benefit of his wife and the issue of the marriage, on the ground that the settlement arose out of a fraudulent scheme, to which the wife was a party, to defeat the husband's creditors, he being at the time hopelessly insolvent. The husband and wife and the trustees of the settlement were defendants to the suit. As to some of the property comprised in the settlement, the question was raised whether it did not form part of the joint estate of the husband and a person with whom he had carried on business in partnership, instead of being his separate estate, and the trustee in bankruptcy of the partner was also a defendant to the suit. The Vice-Chancellor held that the validity of the settlement could not be impeached so far as it conferred interests on the wife and the issue of the marriage, but his honour directed inquiries to ascertain whether the property was partnership estate. The plaintiff appealed from the decree, and the husband and wife gave a notice of their intention to raise upon the hearing of the appeal the question whether the inquiries as to the nature of the property ought to have been directed, but the notice, not being given in proper time, became abortive. The Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and James and Bramwell, L.J.J.) were of opinion that, as the plaintiff's case had failed, no relief ought to have been granted as between the co-defendants. And they held that r. 5 gave the court full power, independently of any notice by the respondents, to make the decree which ought to have been made in the first instance. They accordingly varied the decree by omitting the inquiries.

APPEAL—APPLICATION TO STRIKE OUT—COSTS IN COURT BELOW NOT PAID BY APPELLANT.—In a case of *Plimpton v. Spiller*, an application was, on the 25th inst., made to the Court of Appeal to strike out an appeal, which was in that day's list for hearing, under the following circumstances:—The action was to restrain the alleged infringement by the defendants of the plaintiff's patent. On the 19th of April, 1877, Jessel, M.R., gave judgment for the plaintiff, with costs. On the 23rd of April the defendants gave notice of appeal, and an order was subsequently made by Jessel, M.R., staying the proceedings under the judgment pending the appeal, with the exception of the taxation and payment of costs, which were to be paid to the plaintiff's solicitor on his giving his personal undertaking to refund them in the event of the appeal being successful. The taxing master made his certificate on the 13th of June, and subpoenas were issued against the defendants. They did not pay the costs, and writs of sequestration were issued against them, but the plaintiff could not recover anything, and there was evidence that the defendants had expressed their intention of not paying the costs. It was urged that the defendants were in contempt, and were not entitled to be heard upon their appeal, and that it ought to be struck out of the list. The court (James, Baggallay, and Brett, L.J.J.), however, held that there was not sufficient ground for depriving the defendants of the right of having their appeal heard. They had only not paid a sum of money which they said they ought not to have been ordered to pay. The plaintiff could still avail himself of all the remedies which the law gave him for enforcing payment of the costs. Non-payment of the costs in the court below would have been a good reason for asking that the defendants should give security for the costs of the appeal, but it was too late to make an application of that kind after the costs of the appeal had been incurred and it was in the paper for hearing. And the Court of Appeal had always refused to require security to be given for the costs in the court below as a condition of the hearing of an appeal. The application was accordingly refused. In the same case, on the 26th inst., the Court of Appeal (James, Baggallay, and Brett, L.J.J.) affirmed the decision of Jessel, M.R., thus in effect affirming his decision.

*Plimpton v. Malcolmson* (L. R. 3 Ch. D. 531), that the fact that an American book containing a description of a patented invention had been before the date of the patent deposited in the Patent Office in London, it not being shown that the book was in fact accessible to the public, did not amount to a prior publication, so as to make the patent void on the ground of want of novelty.

**APPEAL FOR COSTS—COSTS IN DISCRETION OF COURT—TRUSTEE—MONEY PAID INTO COURT UNDER THE TRUSTEE RELIEF ACT—JUDICATURE ACT, 1873, s. 49—ORD. 55—EXERCISE OF GENERAL POWER OF APPOINTMENT BY WILL—RIGHT OF EXECUTOR TO DISTRIBUTE FUND.**—An appeal from the decision of Malins, V.C., in *In re Hoskin's Trusts* (L.R. 5 Ch. D. 229) was in the list for hearing before the Court of Appeal on the 25th inst. On the appeal being opened the preliminary objection was taken by the respondents that the appeal was brought for costs only without any leave of the judge. The order of the Vice-Chancellor was made upon a petition for payment out of court of a fund which had been paid in by trustees under the Trustee Relief Act. The fund was subject to a general power of appointment by will given to a married woman, and she, by her will, which was made in the lifetime of her husband, and was expressed to be made in exercise of the power, bequeathed some legacies, and directed that the residue of the fund should be divided among five persons. And she appointed two executors, one of whom proved the will. The husband had a life interest in the fund, and after his death the trustees of the settlement offered to pay it to the beneficiaries, but some difficulty arose as to the proof of their title, and the trustees, with the consent of the executors, paid the fund into court. The beneficiaries petitioned for payment of the fund to them. Malins, V.C., held that it was clearly settled by *Re Philbrick's Settlement* (34 L.J. Ch. 368) and *Hayes v. Oatley* (L.R. 14 Eq. 1) that the executor could have given a valid discharge for the fund, and that the trustees ought to have paid it to him. The Vice-Chancellor held that under these circumstances the trustees were not justified in paying the money into court, and that they must pay the costs of the petition. It was urged upon his lordship that the decisions upon which he relied were in conflict with that of the House of Lords in *Drake v. The Attorney-General* (10 Cl. & F. 257), but he was of opinion that that was not so. The trustees appealed from the decision. In answer to the preliminary objection it was urged on their behalf that the costs of a trustee, like those of a mortgagee, are not absolutely in the discretion of the court, that *prima facie* he is entitled to his costs out of the trust fund, though his conduct may be such as to deprive him of that *prima facie* right. But the Court of Appeal would go into the case, and judge for itself whether he had lost his *prima facie* right. Indeed, so far as a trustee was concerned, the only merits in a case of this kind were the question of costs, and in this particular case the question was not strictly one of conduct, but a question which of two decisions was right. Moreover, as the executor consented to the payment into court the trustees ought not to be deprived of their costs. And, by virtue of ord. 55, the principles which guided the court as to the allowance of the costs of trustees and mortgagees before the Judicature Acts still remained in force. The court (James, Baggallay, and Brett, L.J.J.), however, held that the decision in *Taylor v. Dowden* (17 W.R. 779, L.R. 4 Ch. 697) is a conclusive authority that trustees who have been ordered to pay costs personally cannot appeal upon the question of costs alone. And on this ground the appeal was dismissed. But James, L.J., took occasion also to say that he entertained no doubt that the Vice-Chancellor's decision was right on the merits. He thought it was quite settled that in such a case the executor of the donee of the power, whether the donee was a married woman or not, was the proper person to give a discharge for the fund appointed.

**ORDERING WITNESSES OUT OF COURT—SOLICITORS OF PARTIES TO ACTION.**—In the course of the hearing of a case of *Corr v. Taylor*, before Fry, J., on the 23rd inst., which was an action to restrain the alleged infringement of a patent, an application was made that all the witnesses on both sides should be ordered out of court. The defendants'

solicitor was one of the witnesses, and the question was raised whether he ought to be excluded. The objection to his being present was ultimately withdrawn, but Fry, J., took occasion to observe that, if possible, the solicitors of the parties, when they happened to be witnesses, ought not to be excluded, as their absence was a great impediment to the conduct of business.

**POSTPONEMENT OF TRIAL OF ACTION FOR CONVENIENCE OF PARTIES—SUBSEQUENT RIGHT TO PRECEDENCE.**—Application was made to Fry, J., on the 27th inst., with the consent of both parties to an action, for the postponement of the hearing till after a specified day. The order for postponement was made, and the plaintiff's counsel then asked that the case might, after the specified day, be placed in the paper next after any part-heard case. Fry, J., refused to assent to this course, and said that the rule he had laid down was this, that cases which had already been placed in the paper for hearing should take precedence over a case which had been postponed for the convenience of the parties. He thought that this arrangement was the most convenient on the whole, inasmuch as when cases had once got into the paper the parties were compelled to have their witnesses in attendance.

## Societies.

### LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this society held at the Law Institution on Tuesday last, the question for discussion was as follows:—"Does the policy of the Government deserve the confidence of the country?" Mr. Nicholls opened the debate in the affirmative, and was followed by Mr. Mills on the negative side of the question, which was ultimately decided on the side of the opener by a large majority.

### UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held on Monday, the 25th inst., at the Law Institution, to discuss the following point of law:—"A. buys goods of B., and C. guarantees payment of the price. A becomes insolvent before delivery, and before the vendor's right of stoppage *in transitu* is defeated. Can C., upon payment of the price, stop the goods *in transitu*?" Mr. W. Shirley Shirley, B.A., was in the chair. Mr. Trevor C. Edwards opened the discussion in the affirmative, and the question was argued in the negative by Mr. A. Milne and Mr. Simpson. The discussion was continued by Messrs. Eustace Smith, Havergal, Gidney, Moyle, and Quick, and on the question being put to the meeting it was carried in the affirmative by a majority of one. An impromptu discussion followed, in which most of the members present took part.

Another meeting of this society was held, at Clement's Inn Hall, on Wednesday, the 27th inst., Mr. J. S. Rubinstein in the chair. Mr. J. T. Davies opened the subject for the evening's debate, viz., "That the county franchise ought to be assimilated to the borough." Mr. C. Swinfen Eady opposed the motion, and was supported by Messrs. Hart-Cook and Cobbett. Messrs. Gidney, Dawson, and Elsford supported the motion. After a debate the motion was carried by a majority of one in a meeting of twenty-seven members present.

### BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

On Tuesday evening, the 19th inst., the above society held its 610th ordinary meeting in the library room of the Law Society, Jacob Rowlands, Esq., presiding. The following point was discussed:—"A decision of foreign court is given in evidence as deciding that A. owes B. the sum of £1,000 in respect of transactions in that country. A. gives in evidence that the decision was obtained by such evidence (torture, hearsay, &c.) which, though admissible there, is inadmissible here. Can an English court refuse to adopt the decision for the purpose of taking accounts between A. and B.?" The speakers on the affirmative were Messrs. Plant, Hargreave, Donisthorpe,

Edwards, and Goodman; on the negative, Messrs. Cresswell, A. Whitehouse, Cochrane, and Shore. The voting was in favour of the affirmative by a small majority. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the meeting.

#### WORCESTER LEGAL DEBATING CLUB.

This society, which was formed towards the end of last year, for the purpose of debating moot points of law, had its annual dinner on Thursday, the 21st inst., at Hadley Bowring Green. The members present were Messrs. A. J. Beauchamp, G. S. Blakeway, H. Caldicott, F. Ronald Jeffery, W. Lambert, H. E. Macdonald, S. G. N. Spofforth, G. E. M. Taylor, J. Thompson, and J. H. Yonge. There were also several friends of the members present. Mr. H. Corbett, Mr. E. A. Davis, Mr. G. T. Miller, and Mr. T. G. Stallard were unavoidably prevented from attending. The honorary secretary (Mr. S. G. N. Spofforth) read the report of the committee and the financial statement, which were both very satisfactory, and showed the club to be in a flourishing condition. Mr. Taylor moved, and Mr. Blakeway seconded, a vote of thanks to the Worcester and Worcestershire Law Society for their kindness in lending the club the use of their room in Pierpoint-street wherein to hold the debates. The privilege of using this room, which contains a most valuable collection of law books, is very highly appreciated by the club. After several appropriate toasts had been duly honoured, and the musical tastes of those present had been indulged by the hearty rendering of a few festive and humorous songs and choruses, the members and their friends adjourned to the charming lawn to enjoy a few games at bowls, and thus a most agreeable evening was brought to a close.

#### Appointments, &c.

Mr. HENRY COTTON, Q.C., has been appointed one of the Lord's Justices of Appeal, in succession to the Right Hon. Sir George Mellish, deceased. Mr. Cotton is the son of the late Mr. William Cotton, of Walwood House, Leytonstone (many years a director of the Bank of England, and one of the chairmen of quarter sessions for the county of Essex), and was born in 1821. He was educated at Eton, and was formerly a student of Christchurch, Oxford, where he graduated second class in classics and first class in mathematics. He was called to the bar in Hilary Term, 1846, and became an equity draftsman and conveyancer. In 1866 he became a Queen's Counsel, and selected the court of Vice-Chancellor Malins, and he has also had a large practice in Scotch appeals to the House of Lords and before the Privy Council. Mr. Cotton is a bencher of Lincoln's-inn, and in 1872 he succeeded Lord Selborne as counsel to the University of Oxford.

Mr. WILLIAM MAJOR COOKE, stipendiary magistrate at Clerkenwell, has been appointed a Magistrate at Marylebone Police-court, in succession to Mr. Louis Charles D'Eynonrt. Mr. Cooke was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1848, and formerly practised on the Western Circuit. He was for several years recorder of Southampton, and was appointed a magistrate at Worship-street in 1862, and was transferred to Clerkenwell in 1866.

Mr. HENRY GOODY, solicitor and notary (of the firm of Smythies, Goody, & Son), of Colchester, has been appointed Solicitor to the Colchester Building Society, in the place of Mr. William Alfred Neck, who has resigned.

Mr. GEORGE MURRAY M'GUSTEY, solicitor, of Dublin, has been appointed Registrar of the Court of the Recorder of Dublin. Mr. M'Gustey was admitted a solicitor in Ireland in 1854.

Mr. GRANVILLE ROBERT HENRY SOMERSET, D.C.L., Q.C., has been appointed Recorder of the City of Gloucester, in succession to the late Mr. Charles Shapland Whitmore, Q.C. Mr. Somerset is the eldest son of Lord Granville Somerset, and was born in 1824. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, and subsequently became a

Fellow of All Souls' College, and proceeded to the degree of D.C.L. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1851, and became a Queen's Counsel in 1868, and he is a member of the Oxford Circuit, practising also before parliamentary committees. Mr. Somerset is a bencher of the Inner Temple and a magistrate and deputy chairman of quarter sessions for Monmouthshire.

MR. JAMES FREDERICK SYMONDS, solicitor, has been appointed a Magistrate for the City of Hereford. Mr. Symonds has also been re-appointed Under-Sheriff of Herefordshire for the ensuing year. He was admitted a solicitor in 1841, and is an alderman for Hereford (having served as mayor of the city in 1867), clerk of indictments for the county, and clerk to the lieutenancy.

#### Obituary.

##### MR. JOHN BAILY, Q.C.

Mr. John Baily, Q.C., died at his residence, Stoney Hills, Esher, on the 19th inst. Mr. Baily was born in 1805, and was formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1828 as second wrangler and second Smith's Prizeman. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Easter Term, 1832, and in 1851 he received a silk gown from Lord Truro. He practised for many years before Vice-Chancellor Kindersley, the leading business of that court being divided pretty equally between himself and Mr. Glasse, Q.C. Mr. Baily was a most accomplished lawyer, and was very popular among his professional brethren. Ten years ago he was compelled by the weakness of his chest to retire from practice. The illness which caused his death was very short. Mr. Baily was a bencher of Lincoln's-inn, and was for many years one of the standing counsel to the University of Cambridge, and a member of the Council of Legal Education. His eldest son, Mr. Walter Baily (late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge), was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Easter Term, 1862, and is now one of her Majesty's inspectors of schools.

We have received from Messrs. McNiven & Cameron a box of their pens, which we can testify, from actual use, are very flexible and well finished, and of so many different kinds as to meet the requirements of every penman.

Mr. Forsyth gave notice in the House of Commons on Thursday that on the earliest day which he could command he should move a resolution, "That, considering the importance of the questions in the administration of the law that arose in the absence of a public prosecutor in criminal prosecutions, it was the opinion of the House that a Minister of Justice should be appointed."

The death of Viscount Canterbury, says the London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, renders vacant a sinecure office of considerable value—namely, the registrarship of the faculty of the province of Canterbury. This ecclesiastical appointment was conferred upon the deceased nobleman when he was quite an infant by his grandfather, Dr. Manners Sutton, the then Archbishop of Canterbury. The duties of the office were executed by deputy, whilst the emoluments consisted, and still consist, of the major proportion of the fees payable on faculties for church restorations, monuments, and for marriages by the archbishop's potent special licence. The late viscount's elder brother was also provided for in the same way by the worthy grandfather, he having held from childhood the sinecure post of registrar of the Prerogative Court, the value of which may be estimated when it is stated that, on the abolition of that court in 1858, the sum of £7,000 a year was awarded as compensation to the noble registrar. I understand that Viscount Canterbury's successor at the Faculty Office will have to perform the duties personally and at a very greatly reduced stipend; also that the appointment will be united to that of the registrar of the province. The surplus will be disposed of under the provisions of the Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees Bill now before Parliament.

## Legal News.

Mr. Cotton, the newly appointed Lord Justice of Appeal, took his seat yesterday on the bench of the Court of Appeal at Lincoln's-inn.

On Monday, in the House of Commons, Mr. Cross, in reply to Sir W. Bartelot, who asked whether the assizes, having been fixed for a date earlier by a fortnight than usual, would not clash with the quarter sessions, said he had been in communication with the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Chief Justice on the subject, and that he hoped an arrangement would be made by which the inconvenience referred to would be obviated in future. Sir W. W. Wynn asked the right hon. gentleman whether the judges did not go circuit under a commission of general gaol delivery, and whether he was aware that the Lord Chief Baron had declined to try any prisoners committed to the sessions. Mr. Cross said he was not aware that the Lord Chief Baron had come to any such decision. He would, however, make inquiry into the matter.

Mr. Justice Hawkins, in charging the grand jury at the Cumberland Assizes on Thursday, said the judges in arranging the circuits had many things to take into consideration, and in fixing the dates of the assizes their sole desire was to suit the convenience of those who had to attend the assizes. At the same time, owing to the immense number of prisoners for trial, the arrangements had to be made somewhat different from those which had been very often made on previous occasions. It had been said that judges visiting assize towns might interfere with the duties of magistrates in quarter sessions. He could not help thinking that there had been some misapprehension on this subject. Under the commission by which he was sitting that day, he had the power, if he thought it expedient to do so, to try the prisoners committed for trial for offences cognizable by quarter sessions, and if it were deemed expedient in any particular case that any person who would otherwise be tried at quarter sessions should be tried by him, he should not, in order to take the work off his shoulders, remit him to quarter sessions. So far from occupying the time and attention of judges with cases which were properly cognizable by quarter sessions, the judges were commanded by her Majesty's commission to deliver the prisons, but in each there was a proviso that they should not be called upon to deliver the prisoners committed for trial at quarter sessions unless they thought it expedient so to do. He therefore did not intend to interfere with the ordinary cases sent for trial by quarter sessions, though he considered it expedient to dispose of one or two of these cases for reasons which he need not explain more at length.

On Tuesday, in the House of Lords, the Earl of Onslow asked her Majesty's Government whether it was intended always to limit the duration of the Surrey assizes to six days, and why the county of Surrey should be the only one exempted from the statutory rule which allowed suitors to name the county or place in which they proposed that their actions should be tried. The Lord Chancellor in reply assured the noble earl that Surrey was not excepted from the statutory rules referred to. Every suitor had a perfect right to name any county where his action might be tried, but, on the other hand, there was another right on the part of the judge. If he found an action set down for trial in a county which had no connection with the case, he had a perfect right to send it back to the county to which it really belonged. What had been done with regard to Surrey was this—Before the present arrangements were made, the practice was that all sittings in London or in Middlesex for the trial of jury cases came to an end towards the end of June, when the learned judges went upon circuit. From the time the judges went on circuit, about the end of June until the following November, there was no means of trying cases in London or Middlesex. The result of that was where there was any case pressing for trial the plaintiff set it down for trial at Guildford or Croydon or any other place near London rather than have it thrown over till November. But one of the great objections to that practice was, that in Croydon or Guildford one or two or three hundred cases, perhaps, were set down for trial that had nothing whatever to do with the county of Surrey, and which would have

been tried in London if there had been the means of trying them in London. That practice involved great expense in the sending down of witnesses. As a remedy, it was suggested that, Surrey being so very near London, the Surrey assizes might be dispensed with altogether, and the Surrey cases and the Surrey prisoners be brought to London for the purpose of trial. The county of Surrey objected very much to that, and in consequence of that objection it was arranged that two of the learned judges who had to try the cases in London and Middlesex should go down to Surrey and continue the Surrey assizes for the purpose of trying the Surrey cases. That worked very well for some time. What had happened lately was this. There was a very considerable number of cases to be tried in London and Middlesex, and it occurred to some solicitors in London that they might get a trial of them by abstaining from putting them down for trial in the regular list and putting them down for trial in Surrey. The consequence was that very suddenly a considerable number of cases were put down for trial at Guildford or Croydon which had no connection whatever with the county of Surrey. Therefore, an order was made which put an end to that abuse. The judges who went down to Surrey would devote an adequate number of days to the disposing of the whole business of Surrey.

The *Pall Mall Gazette*, discussing the subject of punishments, says:—Some princes have made punishments quite amusing—to all except the person most concerned. Thus Don Carlos, son of Philip II., irritated at the pain caused him by a pair of tight boots, had them cut up and served in a stew, which the unfortunate boot-maker was compelled to eat to the last morsel. Before we condemn the Prince of Spain for cruelty, we should each try to call to mind our own feelings when wearing tight boots. Most of us have probably wished the maker of them in a much worse position than the “purveyor to his Royal Highness.” We fear it was no other than the “good” Haroun-al-Raschid who, from very much the same confused ideas on the subject of retributive justice as troubled the brain of Don Carlos, had a baker baked in his own oven for selling adulterated bread to the people. But perhaps at once the most ludicrous and the most terrible punishment ever imagined was that which an unfortunate gentleman who resided at St. Petersburg in the reign of Catherine II. had reason for a short time to expect. Ségur describes the hero of the narrative as a stranger naturalized in Russia, Sutherland by name, and banker by profession. Very likely his real name was Sutherland, and his nationality Scotch or English. He stood high in the favour of the Empress, who had deposited considerable sums of money with him. One morning a servant came and told Mr. Sutherland that the house was surrounded with soldiers, and that an officer of police desired to speak to him. The officer, whose name was Relieu, next entered and informed the banker that their “most gracious” Sovereign had charged him to execute an order the severity of which positively frightened him. He then tried to break the news gently, allowing the agitated banker to put one question after another. “Is it Siberia?” Sutherland at length faltered. “Alas! one returns from Siberia,” answered Relieu. “Prison!” “One comes out of prison.” “Good God! I am not to be knotted?” “The knot is terrible, but does not kill.” (He should have said, “does not always kill.”) “Is my life, then, in peril?” almost sobbed the banker; “the Empress so good, so clever—but let me know the worst.” “Well, my dear friend,” quoth the officer in a doleful voice, “my most gracious Sovereign has commanded me to have you stoned.” The unhappy part of the affair was that Relieu, though a kind-hearted man, would not admit that he could have mistaken the Czarina's injunctions, which, moreover, he had evidently no intention of disobeying. In vain the banker expostulated, implored, protested. Relieu was sure there was no error. He had indeed, he said, ventured to say to her Majesty that the command was a strange one, and had made appeal to her well-known clemency, but she had cut short his first sentence with the remark, impatiently uttered, that his duty was to obey orders and not to comment on them. At length, however, Relieu so far overcame his own fears as to agree to carry a note to the Empress. Even as he went his heart failed him, and he repaid instead to the house of Count Bruce, who, on hearing the story, thought the officer of police must be mad. Hastening to the palace, Count

Bruce demanded and obtained an audience of the Empress ; and it need hardly be added that then at length the mystery was solved. Her Majesty had just lost a beautiful dog, the gift of the banker, and called after him "Sutherland." Of course it was the dead favourite and not his quondam master who was to be stuff'd. But why should an officer of police be asked to superintend the stuffing of a dead dog ? It was not poor Relieu who was altogether to blame for the fright occasioned to a most respectable banker.

### THE PROGRESS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW.

PROFESSOR LORIMER, in his introductory lecture to the class of public law in the University of Glasgow, made the following remarks on this subject. We quote from the *Scottish Journal of Jurisprudence* :

From causes which I shall be able partially to explain to you, the existing rules which regulate the relations of States are very far from having attained, or even from having determined, the objects which they seek. But in this branch of jurisprudence we shall have at any rate this advantage, that in passing from the abstract to the concrete, from the general to the special, we shall experience no diminution in its interest or its dignity. The minutest and apparently the most arbitrary provisions of municipal law, the most narrowly local police regulations, provided they are suited to the attainment of their objects, are all, it is true, recognitions of the same great principles. Their ultimate end, that from which their dignity is derived, is the same as that of the law of nations—well-being, namely, and progress, physical, moral, and intellectual; and they seek it by the same general means—the vindication of the correlative principles of liberty and order. There is nothing necessarily sordid in their character, nothing unreasonable or capricious in their minutest provisions; for God has so linked all human interests together that the same great laws govern them all, and the smallest miscarriage of justice is an injury to mankind. Nor is the dominion of principle less traceable where its action is confined within a narrow sphere. The tiniest creature, when brought near to us by the microscope, is as suggestive of the laws of physical life and development as the greatest; and there is no obstacle to our reading the book of natural law in municipal as well as in international relations. Still, there are few lessons which do not gain in impressiveness by the grandeur of the examples by which they are illustrated; there are few games the interest of which is not enhanced by the magnitude of the stakes. Now, it is characteristic of public law in all its departments, and more especially in that department in which it deals with the relations of State to State (in which it may be said to be twice public), that it is occupied with interests so vast as to lend altogether a novel and even startling aspect to principles which are so familiar as to pass almost unheeded when their action is exhibited in other departments of jurisprudence. As fire and water, from being tame and homely elements, the intrinsic qualities of which are forgotten in their familiar application, impress us with their power and their majesty when we see them in the volcano or the cataract, so, in like manner, our imagination is taken captive, and our attention is arrested, by the deep and terrible significance of principles which, in municipal law, would have led at most to a protracted litigation, or the disruption of a mercantile contract, when fleets are manned and armies march forth for their vindication, or when States are torn asunder in consequence of their neglect.

At first sight it seems as if the arrangements for the vindication of these principles on so great a scale ought scarcely to be discussed by private persons at all—as if questions, on the correct or erroneous solution of which the progress or retrogression of the whole human family for ages may possibly depend, could be becomingly approached only by States and Ministers of State. So far, however, is this from being the prevailing feeling of our day, that there are few subjects which are at present discussed with greater freedom and confidence. Being surrounded by fewer technicalities, and incomparably less traditional formality, than most of the branches of municipal law, the law of nations is regarded as the only department of jurisprudence which is altogether on a level with

the popular understanding. That, for these reasons, it is approachable by the non-professional understanding is no doubt true; for Grotius and Bynkerhoek may be read with pleasure by any educated gentleman, and, even in the interminable pages of Puffendorf, it is their prolixity, far more than their obscurity, which he would find to stand in his way. But this very fact, when rightly considered, ought to form a ground for caution; for being covered over, as it were, by a thinner coating of contingent regulations, we sooner arrive at its vital principles; and whereas in other branches of law numerous changes may be made which affect mere matters of convenience, or resolve themselves into questions of trifling saving of time or money, here it is scarcely possible to offer a single suggestion which does not touch the essence of the system and the interests of mankind.

And yet the balance of advantage is altogether in favour of questions of international law being openly and freely, even if at times they should be rashly, disused. For not only does it derive its authority, in so far as it has become a system of positive constitutional law, from the general consciousness of civilized mankind in the last instance—a characteristic which is common to it with municipal laws within the narrower sphere of their operation—but, unlike them, it continues, at every moment of its existence, to be dependent on public sentiment for its binding force.

In the absence of any cosmopolitan Legislature, by which its rules can be adjusted to new emergencies; of any cosmopolitan tribunal by which its recognized *dicta* can be applied to individual cases; and of any central executive by which its decrees can be enforced, the whole body of civilized and intelligent mankind become the judges by whom its requirements are measured out; and their verdict is the warrant on which individual nations, or groups of nations who for the time may have allied themselves, can alone proceed with confidence to enforce its provisions. It is well remarked by Heffter, that the great distinction between the science, in the form in which it is presented to us by the writers of last century, and that which it has now assumed, consists in the open recognition which is now given to the influence of public opinion. In *basis a long*, as I have said, was, of necessity, the public conscience. But, down to the period of the French Revolution, it was the public conscience as interpreted by princes and Cabinets and plenipotentiaries. In our day it is the public conscience, guided and enlightened in this country, and, indeed, generally in Europe—God be praised—by the educated and cultivated portions of society; but still, even in States which are not constitutional, expressing itself directly, freely, and on the whole, I think I may add, intelligently through the press. The effect of the change amongst civilized States—which alone come, or ought to come, within the range of international recognition—has been enormously to increase the power of moral, and to diminish the necessity for physical, interference with each other's conduct. In former times the remonstrance of a foreign Government, as expressed by an ambassador acting on the instructions of his Sovereign, or of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, was always more or less known to be an expression of mere personal opinion. Whether it was the opinion of the monarch himself or of his Minister, or even if it purported to be that of a whole Cabinet, it was not in general difficult to identify it with the single man by whom, in such matters, the counsels of the nation were known to be led. It was the opinion of Richelieu, or Mazarin, or Oxenstern—speaking in the name of France or of Sweden, no doubt—but it was not the opinion of France or of Sweden directly uttered, in a form the present validity of which foreign nations could test by their own observation. Now there is an instinctive repugnance on the part both of individuals and nations to yield to the opinion of a single individual, or of a few individuals, whom they have not accepted as their natural rulers; and thus it was that, if the opinion was adverse to the course of policy which national ambition or vanity had marked out, it was pretty sure to be rejected with scorn. Nor was the case greatly altered by the concurrence of several Governments; for that was but the addition of two or three foreigners more, of whom little was known but their names, and whose personal character and motives it was easy, not only to disparage, but to

dissociate from those of the nations which they professedly represented. If there was the prospect of an immediate coalition of foreign armies, the matter would, of course, assume a serious aspect; but what is called a "moral remonstrance" was almost certain in those days to be disregarded by a Sovereign of any determination of character, or to be drowned by anything approaching to a clamorous expression of national enthusiasm. But the effect is very different when, by the concurrence or dissent of the press and of popular assemblies, foreign nations can ascertain for themselves to what extent the Governments which presume to advise them are, or are not, the organs of the communities which they professedly represent. To differ with individuals is a necessity of such frequent occurrence that men and nations make up their minds to it with no great hesitation; and it is easy to differ, with a few who are distant when we have the support and sympathy of many who are near. But to differ, not only with the majority, but with a majority which consists, or seems likely to extend itself to the whole civilized world, to oppose ourselves to the spirit of the age in which we live, is a course which few leaders will be rash enough long to persevere in, and in which a single community will rarely be so inconsiderate as to follow them even if they do. On a recent memorable occasion, which is no doubt present to your minds, we ourselves reaped the benefit of the open discussion of which I speak. Had we lived under the old régime of diplomacy, there is much reason to suspect that we should at this moment have been engaged in a bloody, and, in my humble opinion, an unjust war. Here public opinion spoke out to control. Let me mention an occasion on which it stepped in to support the attitude which its representatives had assumed. It was the unanimity of the press and of the public, in this country and on the Continent, quite as much as the support of foreign diplomacy, or our own energetic preparations for war, which, when the Trent affair occurred, convinced the Northern States of America, if not of the error, at least of the imprudence of their officer, and saved us from being plunged into a very distressing and perhaps formidable conflict with a nation which, of all others, is nearest to us in blood and traditions.

But these observations, whilst they illustrate the advantages attendant on the widest dissemination of sound and just opinions on questions of international law, point not less clearly to the new dangers of practical mischief which have arisen from the more popular basis on which the system itself has been placed in modern times. The power of modifying individual action, and taming down national excitement, on the part of the educated classes, as I have attempted to show you, has been greatly increased. But the probability that occasions will arise in which the exercise of this power will be called for has not been diminished. It is the tendency of all human passions and impulses, which possess within them a really vital principle, to carry out that principle to a point at which it becomes self-contradictory in theory, and self-destructive in practice. When this point is reached, the tendency does not simply cease, but gives place to its opposite. When faith degenerates into superstition, it does not stop there, but bounds off to the opposite pole of scepticism. Idealism, pushed to the limit at which it is contradicted by consciousness and experience, makes way for materialism in theory and utilitarianism in practice, which, in their turn, work out their own refutation. I need not multiply examples. The tendency, or law, as, from the uniformity of its action, it may well be called, must often have been pointed out to you, and illustrated in the course of your studies, not only of mental, but of material science; for it is in virtue of its action in the physical world that "bones and ashes make the golden corn." Now, there is no principle in the case of which this law—which popular speech has embodied in the adage that "extremes meet"—has received more frequent historical illustration than in that of national liberty; and my object in alluding to it at present is that I may remind you that the moment that that principle is pushed to the point at which it neutralizes its own action, we are placed by it, as it were, between two extremes, and are opposed, almost simultaneously, to the action in excess, not only of

it, but of its opposite. The transition being, not to the lowest, but to the highest, action of the opposite principle, we do not take leave of one class of dangers in order that we may come gradually into the presence of the other. We pass to it all at once, and we encounter a principle, the characteristic dangers attendant upon which we had almost forgotten, in a higher degree of activity than that which it exhibited when we last experienced it. I believe that this phenomenon is actually being exhibited to some extent in the political life of Europe, and to a very great extent in that of America, at the present moment. The principle of liberty is that which, in recent times, has been most actively at work, and, though not unimpeded by its own excesses, it has been generally victorious. Without referring to instances which your own knowledge of past and contemporaneous history will readily suggest to you, I think I may say that it has now been practically dominant for a longer period than any during which it ever obtained sway in the history of progress.

But what I wish you to observe is that, wherever the principle of liberty has been, in appearance, completely triumphant—wherever its action has become exclusive of that of all other principles, even for a time—it has not only imperilled its own success in the community in which it was manifested, but it has placed surrounding States in danger at once of the evils which are kindred to it, and of those which belong to the principles which it seemed to exclude. It is unnecessary that I should illustrate these observations by referring to the past history of France, and I am not courageous enough to predict her future; but I may venture to remind you that, since the termination of the great American War, the Southern States have been suffering, at the hands of democratic adventurers, a despotism worse than France ever suffered from the most despotic of her Kings or Emperors. With the internal politics of America I have no immediate concern, and no problem seems darker to me than that which is presented by the future of that most abnormal country, in which political speculators are watching, for the first time on so great a scale, the result of the experiment whether an organized society and a homogeneous state can be reared from the cuttings of old branches, in place of being grown, like other communities, from the seed. In what manner this result, if possible, shall be brought about is a question which the future alone can answer. But what I assert is, that America, as it at present exists, and as it existed for a long time previous to the civil war, combines in its internal government most of the evils of a despotism, as well as of a democracy, and exposes foreign Governments, in dealing with it, to the dangers arising from both of these forms of government. The chief reason why a despotic country is dangerous to its neighbours, as I have already indicated, is that you cannot reason with it directly; you cannot get at it, as you get at a free country, through its press; it is not permitted to listen to what you have to say to it in support of your claims or your remonstrances, and it becomes acquainted with them only when it experiences the consequences of their rejection. Now the very same difficulty exists in dealing with America. King Mob has there gagged the press as effectually as any brother despot that ever gave a warning. He will not allow himself to be spoken to, except in accents of adulation and assent; and if you approach him in any other tone, the only answer which he deigns to make to you is a re-assertion of his former position, as confident and uncompromising as if it proceeded from the Comte de Chamford or Pio Nono himself. Strange and almost incredible as it seems to us, the sad and instructive fact is attested by writers of the very highest authority, native as well as foreign, that this democratic country has shut itself out from the advantages of free political discussion so effectually that it is perhaps not too much to say that no monarchical State in Europe ever was as impervious to the voice of counsel from without as America has been during the present century.

The lesson, then, which the contemporaneous history of Europe and America seems to teach to the international lawyer and politician is that the advantages to the cause of international tranquillity arising from the effect which the recognition of the public conscience, as the basis of international law, unquestionably has in increasing the power of moral interference are for the present counter-

balanced, to no inconsiderable extent, by other results of the prevalence of the principle of liberty. Wherever that principle becomes anarchic, or is kept in check only by influences so little likely to be permanent as those which now govern France, and has not finally allied itself with the principle of order by the creation of an organized society, of which each member, whilst he asserts his own freedom of action within his own sphere, cheerfully and loyally accords the same freedom to others, its tendency is to increase rather than to diminish the risk of international misunderstandings and consequent collisions. And the lesson for us which I derive from all these considerations is the very great and increasing responsibilities which modern society imposes on the educated classes, and the emphasis with which it urges on them the duty of addressing themselves to those very studies in which we are about to engage.

I regret that the narrow limits of our course will prevent me from giving to this important branch of it all the development which I could desire; but into the fundamental doctrine of recognition, from which all its other doctrines flow, I hope to enter with considerable fulness. Recognition is the birth of the separate State into the family-cosmopolitan—its title to claim a *locus standi* within the sphere of the positive law of nations. In defining recognition we determine the international character of the State by assigning to it its rights and its responsibilities, both in the normal relations of friendly intercourse, and in the abnormal relations of neutrality and war.

The subject notwithstanding, perhaps in consequence of its momentous importance, has made little progress, in a scientific point of view, since the time of Grotius. His immediate followers were deficient in the strength of analytical vision which had enabled him to look international relations, as the phenomena of contemporaneous history presented them to him, right in the face, and to ask what had been said of them by others, only to the extent and for the purpose of seeing them better himself. For a time, down indeed to the time of Vattel, the imitators and admirers of Grotius tried to do as he had done. But they added little to his doctrines; and such practical ameliorations as have since taken place in the conduct of international affairs—for example, the greater openness and honesty in diplomacy, and the greater humanity to the wounded and to non-combatants in war—have been forced on rather by the increasing influences of general civilization than by any advances which have been made in this department of scientific jurisprudence. We have had scarcely any attempt at further definition. The ditches of intervention and neutrality, to take the two most conspicuous instances, have remained as vague as Grotius left them. Many of the text-writers have even permitted them to slip away from their ethical moorings altogether, and to drift, without oar or rudder, into the shifting currents of expediency, utility, and immediate self-interest; whilst those against whom so heavy a charge cannot be made, have occupied themselves chiefly in pouring the contents of one old bottle into another. The consequence is that even those who have adopted the historical method have effected little more than to incumber the Grotian teaching with voluminous, unrigged, and often irrelevant illustrations. They have written bad histories, not of events, or even of treaties—which are a kind of events, and always teaching something—but of protracted negotiations and intrigues; and of notes, memorials, and protocols, and other diplomatic efforts in what *Punch* has very aptly characterized as the “waste-paper line.” It would be very presumptuous in me to suppose that by any individual efforts of mine I could atone for errors like these. All that I can hope to do is, by reverting to the philosophical traditions by which Grotius was inspired, and which your own great teachers have never forgotten, to revive a method which, in so far as the circumstances of his time and his own eventful life permitted him to pursue it, was so fruitful in his hands. If I can induce you, in the first branch of the course, to go back from Austin to Aristotle, and in the second, from Wheaton to Grotius—if I can persuade you to substitute the facts of nature for the prejudices of conventionalism, I shall feel that I have given you, who have life before you, a fresh start on a road which may lead you to great results which I shall never reach. Rome was not built in a day; and the law of nations, even when its study is rationally pursued, will not be completed, and rounded off, and “codified” by one man or by one generation. It is a work, on the con-

trary, which will never be completed at all, even theoretically, for, as theory throws light upon practice, so practice throws light upon theory, and both are in continual flux—we must hope in continual progress. As municipal legislation demands the continuous efforts of the best minds in each State, international legislation, if it is continuously to realize the abstract in the concrete, will demand the continuous efforts of the best minds in every State. Would that we saw the beginnings of such conscious and ordered activity!

To private international law, which will occupy us in the last instance, I hope also to give some additional interest and significance by presenting it to you, not as an isolated, exceptional, and indeed contradictory branch of jurisprudence—as is the common view of it in this country—but as resting on the same fundamental principles, and resulting logically from the same great doctrine of the recognition of the international existence of the State, which, as I have said, is the groundwork of the whole system. For this reason I shall speak of it as the “reciprocal recognition of each other's private municipal law by separate States,” rather than as the “conflict of laws,” the term by which it is probably best known to most of you, or that of “comity,” which is altogether misleading, and has now been abandoned everywhere, I believe, except in England.

The object which private international law—is, adopting the least objectionable of the popular epithets, we may continue to call it—sets before it, is to determine the occasions on which, and the limits within which, the interests of justice demand that effect should be given to the municipal laws of one State within the territories of another; or, as Savigny puts it, “to fix the local limits of the dominion of the rules of law over legal relations.” The problem which this doctrine embraces has been very vaguely presented by many writers, both to their readers and themselves. When defined as Savigny has defined it, the subject becomes scientifically very simple. We shall take his luminous treatise—which Mr. Guthrie's excellent translation and valuable annotations have happily domiciled amongst us—as a lantern in our hands; and with its aid I hope we shall find our way through the perplexed and pedantic disquisitions by which it has been so often encumbered. The subject is one which has made far greater progress in our own day than any other branch of the law of nations. The track on which Savigny set out has been boldly and successfully followed, within the last few years, by my distinguished friends and colleagues in the Institute of International Law, M. Mancini, the present Italian Minister of Justice, and by M. Brocher, the President de la Cour de Cassation at Geneva.

Another learned and gifted friend, whose name is better known in this country, Mr. Westlake, was an early disciple of Savigny's teaching, and I am glad to say promises us soon a new edition of his well-known work.

With these advantages, I hope that we shall succeed in at any rate marking out pretty accurately the boundaries of this province; but the practical difficulties which have been found to attend the solution of the numerous questions which the daily increasing intercourse of nations brings to light in this field are inherent in the nature of the questions themselves. These questions may arise with reference to almost every conceivable legal relation, under every conceivable combination of circumstances, whilst there is scarcely any change, however slight, either in the character of the parties related, or the conditions under which they are brought into contact, which may not modify, or altogether reverse, the decision as to the legal domain to which it properly belongs. To exhaust such a subject, within the limits which we must assign to it for the present, is altogether impossible. So great is its interest and so immediate its professional importance, that, in my humble opinion, it might well engage the serious consideration of the University Commissioners, to whose report we at present look forward with so much hope, whether it ought not to be made the subject of a separate course of lectures. As matters stand, I shall feel that I have done all that can be reasonably expected of me if I lay before you its best established rules, and explain to some extent the grounds on which they rest.

## Courts.

### WRECK COMMISSION COURT.\*

WESTMINSTER.

(Before H. C. ROTHERY, Esq., Wreck Commissioner; and Captain HOLT and Captain SCALES, Assessors.)

June 27, 28.—*The Rifleman.*

This was an inquiry into the loss of the British ship *Rifleman* by burning at sea on the 27th of April.

*W. W. Ravenhill* appeared for the Board of Trade.

*W. Mills Roche* (solicitor), for the master.

In the course of the preliminary examination of witnesses,

*Ravenhill* tendered a witness for the purpose of accounting for the absence of certain important witnesses who were on board the ship at the time of the casualty.

The COMMISSIONER admitted the evidence at that stage of the inquiry as it was tendered to account for the absence of witnesses who would have been called at that stage.

No charge was made by the Board of Trade.

The managing owner of the ship, who had not applied to be made a party, expressed a wish to make a statement.

The COMMISSIONER decided that as he was not a party he could only be heard as a witness, and he was accordingly sworn and examined.

At the close of the evidence there was some little discussion as to the order in which parties should be heard, as no charge had been made, but

The COMMISSIONER directed that the ordinary rule should be followed, and the solicitor for the master be first heard, and then the counsel for the Board of Trade should reply.

The COURT were of opinion that the fire must have been caused by the action of certain of the crew, and returned the master's certificate, but without costs, as they thought the case a very proper one for inquiry.

*The Solicitor for the Board of Trade.*

Solicitors for the master, *Oliver, Botterill, & Roche.*

### COUNTY COURTS.

BARNESLEY.

(Before Mr. Serjeant TINDAL ATKINSON, Judge.)

June 7.—*Barnard Cohen v. Roberts.*

*Same v. Gray.*

Interpleader—Execution creditor paid out of sale of goods comprised in bill of sale by the officer of the court—No remedy by assignee of bill of sale except against the high bailiff.

In giving judgment in this case, his Honour said:—This is an interpleader summons issued by the registrar, who also discharges the duties of the office of high bailiff. The facts, as far as they are necessary for the decision of this case, are that the plaintiff, Cohen, the claimant, is the holder of a bill of sale over the goods of one Robinson. Robinson, being a debtor of the defendant Roberts, was sued in this court for the debt, and Roberts obtained judgment. Execution followed, and was levied by the bailiffs without notice or knowledge that the goods seized formed any part of those included in the bill of sale. The levy was made on the 18th of November, 1876, and the proceeds of the sale were duly paid into court. Shortly afterwards the registrar paid the amount of the debt and costs to Roberts, the execution creditor, and after this—namely, in February of this year—Cohen, who had no knowledge of what had taken place, applied to the registrar, who issued the present interpleader summons; and the question I am called upon to decide is, under these facts, has the summons been rightly issued? And after looking at the provisions of the statute, and the rules under which the limited right of trying interpleaders in these courts is governed, I have come to the conclusion that I have no jurisdiction to make any order in this or any case in which the goods taken in execution under the process of this court, or their proceeds, have been parted with so as to have satisfied the execution creditor's judg-

ment. The 2nd r., ord. 21, clearly supports this view because it provides, after naming what things are to be done by the claimant in order to place himself properly in court, "that any money paid into court under the execution shall be retained by the registrar until the claim shall be adjudicated upon." In looking at what is the law in such a case as the present in the superior courts I find two cases exactly in point. In *Anderson v. Calloway* 1 Cr. & M. 102, it was held that a sheriff is not entitled to relief under the Interpleader Act (1 & 2 Will. 4, c. 53, s. 6) where he has paid over the proceeds of the execution to the judgment creditor, Lord Lyndhurst, C.B., saying in his judgment, "The object of the Act of Parliament was to afford relief to the sheriff where two parties were claiming the property, and he had either the goods or the money in his possession, not to a case where he had paid over the money to one of the parties." The decision in this case was subsequently distinctly affirmed in *Scott v. Lewis*, 2 C. M. & R. 289. I am of opinion that the ground of the decision in these cases, namely, that the goods or their proceeds must, when the claim is made, be in court, so that any order I may make respecting them can be operative and available, applies in principle to the present case, and that the proceeds of the execution here having been parted with to the execution creditor, I have no power to entertain the present application, and the claimant must, therefore, be left to his legal remedies such as he may have against the registrar, acting as high bailiff, for wrongfully taking goods which belonged, not to the execution debtor, but to the claimant.

*Cohen v. Horfield.*

Bill of sale—Pawnbrokers Act, 1872—Liability of pawnbroker for taking in assigned goods.

His Honour in giving judgment said:—The plaintiff in this case seeks to recover from the defendant £25 in the nature of damages for the wrongful conversion of a piano. The facts proved at the trial were, that the plaintiff, Cohen, had advanced to one Frederick Robinson, on the security of a bill of sale of his furniture, of which the pianoforte in question formed a part, the sum of £50, repayable by quarterly instalments. At the time of the alleged conversion by the defendant one of the instalments remained unpaid. The bill of sale contains the usual proviso that upon the payment of the principal sum the bill of sale is to become void, and it also comprises very extensive powers for the holder, on the failure of any of the conditions, to take possession of the furniture. Robinson, while in possession, pledged the pianoforte with the defendant, a pawnbroker, for the sum of ten pounds, and on this coming to the plaintiff's knowledge he made a demand upon the defendant for the delivery of the piano, to which the defendant gave a qualified refusal, but which, on the whole, may be taken to be a refusal to deliver it, and to be evidence of a conversion. In order to support this action there must be in the plaintiff, not only a right of property, but also the right of possession. I have looked carefully through the bill of sale in this case, and I find no covenant that the assignor, Robinson, is to continue in possession until default of payment of any of the instalments so as to bring this case within the decision of *Bradley v. Copley*, 1 C. B. 685, in which it was held that until default by the assignor the action of trover could not be supported, on the ground that the right of possession until such default was made did not exist. In the present case default had been made by the non-payment of the first instalment, and by the terms of this particular bill of sale the right of immediate possession accrued; and the law is even when a demand is necessary before the right of possession accrues to the assignee, that when an assignee of goods who is permitted to remain in possession wrongfully sells, so that he cannot deliver the goods on demand, the assignee may recover against a bona fide purchaser, unless in market overt. It is true that here the pianoforte was not sold, but as between Robinson and the defendant the former could not, unless by payment of the sum for which the piano was pledged, have restored it to its former position, so as to have complied with a demand for its delivery, and still more, as at the time he pledged it to the defendant he had neither the right of property nor the right of possession, and the defendant could, therefore, have no greater right to retain it again.

\* Reported by NEIL H. PATERSON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

the plaintiff than Robinson would have had had a demand on the part of Cohen been necessary. With regard to the argument raised by the counsel for the defendant at the hearing, namely, that the plaintiff should have proceeded before the magistrates under the provisions of the Pawnbrokers Act, 1872, and that, that Act having been passed expressly for the protection of pawnbrokers, it was imperative upon the plaintiff to adopt the form of remedy which the statute provides, I am of opinion that the common law right for plaintiff whose property has been wrongfully taken, and which property has found its way into the hands of another, to sue in trover for damages is not taken away by the statute, and that there must, therefore, in this case be a verdict for the plaintiff. Damages £20 to be reduced to 1s. if the piano be returned within a fortnight.

## Legislation of the Week.

### HOUSE OF LORDS.

June 21.—PRISONS.

This Bill was brought up from the Commons and read a first time.

### BURIALS.

This Bill was withdrawn.

### METROPOLITAN STREET IMPROVEMENTS.

This Bill was read a second time.

### MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT, 1870, AMENDMENT.

This Bill was withdrawn.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (BRIDLINGTON, &c.).

This Bill was read a second time.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (BISHOP AUCKLAND, &c.).

This Bill was read a second time.

### QUARTER SESSIONS (BOROUGHS).

This Bill was read a third time.

### FISHERIES (CRABS, AND LOBSTERS).

This Bill passed through committee.

### TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (BARTON, &c.).

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

### June 22.—OYSTER AND MUSSEL FISHERIES ORDER CONFIRMATION.

This Bill was read a third time.

### FISHERIES (CRABS, AND LOBSTERS).

This Bill was read a third time.

### June 25.—METROPOLITAN COMMONS PROVISIONAL ORDER.

This Bill was read a second time.

### ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (FELMINGHAM, &c.).

This Bill passed through committee.

### RESERVOIRS.

This Bill was read a second time.

### June 26.—GAS AND WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION (ABINGDON, &c.).

This Bill passed through committee.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (Belper Union, &c.).

This Bill passed through committee.

### ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (FELMINGHAM, &c.).

This Bill was read a third time.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

June 21.—PUBLIC WORKS LOAN (IRELAND).

The House went into committee on this Bill, but progress was reported on clause 4.

### ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

This Bill was read a second time.

### MARRIAGES LOCALIZATION (St. PETER'S, ALMONDBURY).

This Bill was read a third time.

### MONEY ORDERS.

Mr. W. H. SMITH introduced a Bill to amend the law with respect to money orders granted or issued by or under the authority of the Postmaster-General.

June 22.—SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND).

The House went into committee on this Bill.

The preamble was postponed and the first three clauses of the Bill were agreed to.

On clause 4, the ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND, speaking on an amendment of Mr. SHAW's which was not pressed, and which proposed to include bankruptcy courts under the operation of the clause, said the question of dealing with those courts was under the consideration of the Government, but that it had not been deemed desirable to include them in the present Bill as forming a part of the High Court of Justice.—The clause was then agreed to, as was also clause 5.

On clause 6, Mr. MELDON moved an amendment that no one should be appointed to fill the office of Lord Chancellor in Ireland unless he was a barrister of fifteen years' standing and a member of the Irish bar.—The amendment was altered by the substitution of "ten" for "fifteen" years, and upon a division was lost by 202 to 106.—Mr. PARNELL moved an addition to clause 6 to the effect that the Lord Chancellor should be appointed in the same manner in which the puisne justices and junior barons of the superior courts of common law in England were appointed before the passing of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873.—The addition was agreed to.

Progress was then reported.

### COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a second time, and referred to a select committee.

### ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

This Bill passed through committee.

### ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON).

This Bill was read a third time.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (ALTRINCHAM, &c.).

This Bill was considered, and the amendments introduced into it by the House of Lords were agreed to.

June 25.—PRISONS (IRELAND).

This Bill went through committee *pro forma*.

### NEW FOREST.

This Bill went through committee.

### METROPOLIS IMPROVEMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION.

This Bill was read a second time.

### PUBLIC HEALTH (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a second time.

### ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (SEWAGE).

This Bill was read a second time.

### FACTORY ACT AMENDMENT.

This Bill was read a second time.

### LOCAL TAXATION.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH introduced a Bill to amend the law with respect to the annual returns of local taxation in England, and for other purposes relating to such taxation.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND).

The House went into committee on this Bill.

Clauses 6 to 9 were ordered to stand part of the Bill, various amendments being negatived.

On clause 10, Mr. DUNBAR moved, in line 5, after "Last Chief Justice," to insert "the Master of the Rolls."—The amendment was agreed to without a division, and the clause was agreed to.

Clauses 11 and 12 were agreed to.

### NEW FOREST.

This Bill was read a third time.

## Law Students' Journal.

### COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

MICHAELMAS EXAMINATION, 1877.

#### Examination of Candidates for Pass Certificates.

The attention of students is requested to the following rules:

No student admitted after the 31st of December, 1872, shall receive from the council the certificate of fitness for call to the bar required by the four Inns of Court unless he shall have passed a satisfactory examination in the following subjects, viz., (1) Roman civil law; (2) the law of real and personal property; (3) common law; and (4) equity.

No student admitted after the 31st of December, 1872, shall be examined for call to the bar until he shall have kept nine terms; except that students admitted after that day shall have the option of passing the examination in Roman civil law at any time after having kept four terms.

An examination will be held in October next, to which a student of any of the Inns of Court, who is desirous of becoming a candidate for a certificate of fitness for being called to the bar, will be admissible.

Each student proposing to submit himself for examination will be required to enter his name, personally or by letter, at the treasurer's or steward's office of the Inn of Court to which he belongs, on or before Wednesday, the 10th of October next; and he will further be required to state in writing whether his object in offering himself for examination is to obtain a certificate preliminary to a call to the bar, or whether he is merely desirous of passing the examination in Roman civil law under the above-mentioned rule.

The examination will commence on Monday, the 22nd of October next, and will be continued on the Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday following.

It will take place in the Hall of Lincoln's-inn, and the doors will be closed ten minutes after the time appointed for the commencement of the examination.

The examination by printed questions will be conducted in the following order:—Monday morning, October 22, at ten, on the law of real and personal property; Tuesday morning, October 23, at ten, on common law; Wednesday morning, October 24, at ten, on Roman law; Wednesday afternoon, October 24, at two, on constitutional law and legal history; Thursday morning, October 25, at ten, on equity.

The oral examination will be conducted in the same order, and on the same subjects, as above appointed for the examination by printed questions.

**Note.**—Only students admitted prior to the 1st of January, 1873, and who are candidates for a pass certificate, have an option of passing in constitutional law and legal history, or Roman law; common law or equity; and real and personal property law.

The examiner in the law of real and personal property will examine in the following subjects:—(1) The creation, devolution, and disposition *inter vivos*, and by will, of estates, and interests in real and personal property, including estates and interests, by way of statutory use, and of trust; (2) The Statute of Mortmain. Candidates will be examined in the elements of the foregoing subjects.

The examiner in common law will examine in the following subjects:—(1) The law of contracts; (2) Criminal law; (3) The procedure in an action in the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions of the High Court of Justice. Candidates will be examined on general and elementary principles of law.

The examiner in Roman law will examine in the following subject:—The Institutes of Justinian. Candidates will be examined in the above-mentioned subject.

The examiners in constitutional law and legal history will examine in the following books and subjects:—(1) Stubb's Constitutional History of England; (2) Hallam's Constitutional History; (3) Broom's Constitutional Law. Candidates will be examined in No. 1 and No. 3 only, or in No. 2 and No. 3 only, of the foregoing subjects, at their option.

**Note.**—Only students admitted prior to the 1st of January, 1873, and who are candidates for a pass certificate, have an option of passing in constitutional law and legal history, or

Roman law; common law or equity; and real and personal property law.

The examiner in equity will examine in the following subjects:—(1) Administration of estates of deceased persons; (2) Mortgages. Candidates will be examined in the above-mentioned subjects.

#### HILARY STUDENTSHIP EXAMINATION, 1878.

#### Jurisprudence, Civil and International Law, and Roman Law.

Candidates for the studentship will be examined in all the following subjects:—(1) Institutes of Gaius and Institutes of Justinian; (2) The Forty-fifth book of the Digests; (3) History of Roman law; (4) Principles of jurisprudence, with special reference to the writings of Bentham, Austin, and Maine; (5) Elements of international law; (6) Principles of private international law. Candidates for honours will be examined in those numbered 1, 3, and 4; candidates for a pass certificate in the Institutes of Justinian.

By Order of the Council,

(Signed) S. H. WALPOLE, Chairman.

Council Chamber, Lincoln's-inn Hall, June 25.

#### THE TOWN CLERK OF MANCHESTER.

On Thursday, at the meeting of the Manchester Town Council, the MAYOR said that, in consequence of the state of Sir Joseph Heron's health, the time had arrived when it was necessary to make arrangements to lessen his labours and duties. It would be useless for him to explain to the Council the services which Sir Joseph Heron had rendered to the Council for a period of nearly forty years. Unfortunately, his health had at last given way, and, if the Corporation wished to retain his invaluable counsel and advice, it would be necessary for them to relieve him from the details of the work which he had for so many years undertaken, and to appoint him to the position of consulting Town Clerk. In accordance with this view, he (the mayor) had drawn up a resolution, which he wished to submit to the Council:—"That, having regard to the faithful, efficient, and invaluable services which during a period of nearly forty years have been rendered to this Corporation and the city by the Town Clerk, it is desirable that arrangements should be made by which, while the advantage of obtaining the advice of Sir Joseph Heron when required in connection with the business of the Corporation will be retained, he shall be to a great extent relieved from the duties devolving upon him as Town Clerk; that Sir Joseph Heron be and is hereby appointed, at the salary which he now receives, consulting Town Clerk, upon the understanding that he will retain the office and continue to discharge the formal duties of Town Clerk until other and final arrangements are made by the Council." It had been well said that the character and abilities of the Town Clerk were to be found in the thirty or forty volumes of the Council's proceedings; but, in addition to Sir Joseph Heron's work in connection with the Corporation, many of the public institutions of Manchester were indebted to him for services the value of which it was impossible to estimate. He (the Mayor) felt that, by relieving the Town Clerk of the details of the work which had previously come under his supervision, and by appointing him to the position of consulting Town Clerk, the Council would reflect honour upon itself and do that which would meet with the concurrence of the citizens at large. In conclusion, he trusted that Sir Joseph would be restored to health, and that the Council would for years to come have the benefit of his counsel and advice.

Mr. Alderman BENNETT could not say that he seconded the resolution with pleasure, because he regretted the necessity of it. He had been accustomed to look upon the Town Clerk for many years as a sort of everlasting man. It never occurred to his mind until the last few months that the time would come when they should have to dispense altogether with the services of the Town Clerk. He had not yet attained "three score and ten," but he was very near it, and, in the ordinary course of nature, the time must come when they would have to dispense

with his services altogether. He had been stricken down during the last few months. He hoped he would recover; but it was certain that he never would be again the man that he had been. What they should aim at doing was to preserve so valuable a life—valuable to the Council and valuable to the city—as long as they could. He had been nearly forty years with the Council; he had grown up with the concern from its infancy, until it had attained its present gigantic proportions; and it was of the greatest importance that the Council should be able to fall back upon him in any period of doubt and difficulty.

The resolution was supported by Mr. HARWOOD and Alderman GRUNDY, and was passed unanimously and with acclamation.

## Court Papers.

### SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

#### ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

DATE.	COURT OF APPEAL.	MASTER OF THE V. C. MAILS.	ROLLS.
		V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.
Monday, July 2	2Mr. Latham	Mr. Milne	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday .....	3 Leach	Merivale	Ward
Wednesday ..	4 Latham	Milne	Pemberton
Thursday ....	5 Leach	Merivale	Ward
Friday .....	6 Latham	Merivale	Pemberton
Saturday .....	7 Leach	Milne	Ward
		Mr. Justice	Fax.
Monday, July 2	2Mr. Farrer	Mr. Koe	Mr. Teesdale
Tuesday .....	3 King	Clowes	Holdship
Wednesday ..	4 Farrer	Koe	Teesdale
Thursday ....	5 King	Clowes	Holdship
Friday .....	6 Farrer	Koe	Teesdale
Saturday .....	7 King	Clowes	Holdship

### HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE. LONDON TRINITY SITTING, 1877.

#### LIST OF ACTIONS FOR TRIAL.

(Continued from page 659.)

Ex 217 R Moir (Mercer & Mercer) v Grant & Clark & Panchard (Ashurst, M & Co; Blunt, T & L)

Ex 218 J Moir (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 219 Mercer (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 220 Morris (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 221 Blane (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 222 Marshall (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 223 Noblett (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 224 Okell (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 225 Peterson (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 226 Pape (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 227 Redfern (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 228 Rowlands (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 229 Seaman (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 230 Sewell (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 231 G Stevenson (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 232 L C Stevenson (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 233 Schofield (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 234 Spowforth (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 235 Sheriff (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 236 Shaul (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 237 Stone (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 238 Thomas (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 239 Treacher (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 240 Townsend (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 241 Waterson (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 242 Wilden (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 243 Wallis (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 244 Waugh (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 245 B. Wood (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 246 E T W Wood (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 247 Wilmot (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 248 Weaver (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 249 Warren (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 250 Taylor (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 251 Turner (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 252 Lowe (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 253 Conyngham (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 254 York (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 255 Copestake, Exor, &c (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 256 Way, Exor, &c (Same) v Same (Same)

Ex 257 Deans (Same) v Same (Same)

Q B 258 Eastwood (Bell, B & G) v Petrie (S Toppin)

Q B 259 Tubbs & anr (Chapple & W) v Robson (Parker, Lee & O)

Ex 260 Bevan (Janson, C & P) v Barber (Keighley, S & B) SJ

Ex 261 Chandler (T Dorant) v Bennett (G Reader)

Q B 262 Meagher & anr (T J Angell) v Nalder (Prior, B & Co)

Q B 263 Lytton Iron Agency, lmd (Stibbard, G & C) v Johnson (Lewis & I)

Q B 264 Same (Same) v Haward (Same)

Q B 265 Aldridge (Stokes, Saunders & S) v Blackmore (E W Cross) SJ

Q B 266 Same (Same) v Avery (Kennedy & C) SJ

C P 267 Allen (Roberts & B) v The Gauthoid Marine Insurance Co of Gothenburg (Bruce, Sons & J) SJ

C P 268 Same (Same) v The Marine Insurance Co Norden Limd of Gothenburg (Same) SJ

Ex 269 Cobb (Champion, R & P) v City of London Brewery Co (W T Ricketts)

Ex 270 Chatterley, Trustee, &c (Whites, R & Co) v Shilling (W R Preston)

C P 271 Thomas (Parker & Clarke) v Hogg, Walker & Co (Walters & G) SJ

C P 272 Scott (R Charles) v General Steam Navigation Co (W Batham)

Ex 273 James Watt & Co (G Webb) v Mersey Steel & Iron Co, lmt (Norris, A & C) SJ

C P 274 Oakes & anr (Dalton & J) v The Midland Railway Co (W R Stevens)

Ex 275 Davies (Leary & P) v Price (J A Bertram)

Ex 276 Morrison (W G Morris) v The North Metropolitan Tramways Co (H C Godfray) SJ

Q B 277 Schnorrberg & anr (Bradford, R & Co) v Jacobs & anr (M H Levinton)

Ex 278 Verden (A Kerly) v Showler (Tillyard & G)

Q B 279 Price, Trustee, &c (Lewis, M & L) v Henderson (Clarke, R & C) SJ

Ex 280 Grundy (Phelps, S & B) v Great Northern Railway Co (Barr, Nelson & Barr) SJ

C P 281 Muller (Freeman & B) v Odessa Waterworks Co, lmt (Hargrove, F & B)

Ex 282 Gibson & wife (Sale, T & K) v London Tramways Co, lmt (H C Godfray) SJ

Q B 283 Master, &c, of the Drapers' Co (Lawford & W) v Barker (Walters & G)

Ex 284 Fotheringham (Lyne & H) v City of Cork Steam Packet Co (Dawes & Sons) SJ

Ex 285 Swasey & Co (Pattison, W & Co) v Richardson (J E Wilson)

C P 286 Straw (Watson, Son & R) v White (H Lloyd & Lane)

Q B 287 Dawson (Lewis, M & L) v Adams (Tidy, H & T)

C P 288 O'Neil (Wilson, B & C) v Parsons (Coilyer-Bristow & Co) SJ

Ex 289 Alnutt (Ingle, C & H) v Malmros (Ingledean, I & G)

Q B 290 Vincent (W H Marshal) v Wood (Watson, Son & R)

Q B 291 R B Smith & Co & anr (Carr, B, D & M) v Procter (J R Chidley) SJ

C P 292 Frederici & Co (Freshfield & W) v Van Der Zee & Co (Simpson & C) SJ

Q B 293 Wallis (Bower & C) v Alexander & anr (Hunt & Son) SJ

Ex 294 James (Jones, B & Son) v Nichols (Vallance & Co)

Q B 295 Torrome (Hollams, Son & C) v Phillips & Hill (Cattarns, J & H) SJ

C P 296 James (J E Carter) v South Eastern Railway Co (W R Stevens)

Q B 297 Zeechin & anr (Courtenay & C) v Broicher (Hollams, Son & C)

Q B 298 Hobson & Co (J McDiarmid) v Davie (Stevens, W & H)

Q B 299 Cu-hway (J M Barnard) v Renwick (Ingledean, I & G)

C P 300 Tuff (J A & H E Farmfield) v Swettenham (Clarkson, Son & G)

C P 301 March & ors (E W Parkes) v Hayes (T J Phipps)

Ex 302 Northway (R Moore) v Davey & ors (W Royle)

Ex 303 Fairbanks (C E Strong) v Mitchell (Crouch & S)

C P 304 Kirk & ors (Lawrence, P & B) v Beck & anr (L Goldberg)

Ex 305 Ostrom & Fischer (H J Coburn) v Hointz (Nash & F)

C P 306 British Land Co, lmd (R & A Russell) v Johnson (T C Russell)

C P 307 Croft (J Croft) v Williams (R Harvey)

C P 308 Loperena (Waltons, B & W) v Tully (Wontner & Sons) SJ

C P 309 Davy & Co (Redpath & H) v General Steam Navigation Co (W Batham) SJ

C P 310 Tarquand (Same) v Pyke (M J Pyke) SJ

Ex 311 Randell, Saunders & Co (Lumley & L) v Thorn & Co (G S & H Brandon)

Q B 312 Cooper (H Reid) v Naylor (F & T Smith & Sons) SJ

Q B 313 Dicks (M Scott & Baker) v Cruicksank & anr (F W Adams)

Q B 314 Jones (Crook & S) v Lundy (Leary & Co)

Q B 315 Rogers (F Bradley) v Anderson (N Willicombe) SJ

C P 316 Green (C E Lamb) v Kirkwood (Allen & Son)

B 317 Bridgett (F Bradley) v Bulmer Brothers (F Heritage)

Q B 318 Pearce (Same) v Same (Same)

Q B 319 Barham (S J Robinson) v Hall (G Blagden)  
 Q B 320 Niger Merchants, limd (Brooks & C) v London and Provincial Marine Insurance Co (Crosley & B) SJ  
 CP 321 Beavers (Waltons, B & W) v Redway (F J & G J Brakenridge) SJ  
 CP 322 Alliance Bank, limd (Crosley & B) v Yule (Phelps & S) SJ  
 CP 323 Vane & ors (J E Shearman & Son) v King (Hillearys & T) SJ  
 Ex 324 Evans (Learoyd & Co) v New Civil Service Co-operation, limd (A T Hewitt) SJ  
 CP 325 Fotheringham (Lowless & Co) v Palmer (Dawes & Sons) SJ  
 CP 326 Stanton (Same) v Pirie & Co (Johnson, Uptons & Co) SJ  
 CP 327 Elmore & arn (Same) v Swettenham (W Batham)  
 CP 328 Hoole (J C Stogdon) v Elbank (J Raven & Co) SJ  
 Q B 329 Cuffe (Morley & S) v Greaves (King & McMillin) SJ  
 CP 330 Schrader (Walter & Mojen) v The Great Eastern Ry Co (W H Shaw) SJ  
 CP 331 Riasau Ry Co (Waltons, B & W) v Wilson & Co (Lowless & C) SJ  
 Q B 332 The London & Yorkshire Steam Ship Co, limd (Cattaneo, J & H) v Gledden (Hollams, Son, & C) SJ  
 CP 333 Burrage (J B Pittman) v Ellis (H S Smith)  
 Q B 334 Chelmers & arn (W Harwood) v Keeling (W W Wynne)  
 Ex 335 Girvin (Mcree & M) v Grant & Clark & Puchard (Ashurst, M, & Co; Blunt, T, & L)  
 Ex 336 Birch (Same) v Same  
 Ex 337 Vincent (Same) v Same (Same)  
 Ex 338 Holt (Keene & M) v Kinney (Wood & H)  
 Ex 339 West (W Tucker) v Bousfield (Sorrell & Son)  
 Q B 340 Birkley (J McDiarmid) v Hollington & arn (Pattison, W & Co)  
 Q B 341 Marcus & arn (A G Ditton) v Kleis (Hollams, Son & C)  
 Q B 342 Cuffe (Morley & S) v Short (Jones, A & J) SJ  
 Ex 343 Rayner (Deane & L) v The Mayor, &c, of Rotherham & arn (Stevens & Co)  
 Q B 344 Dutrulle (Blackford, R, K, & W) v The Compagnie des Messageries Maritimes de France (Gellatly, Son & W)  
 Q B 345 Corbett (Inglewood, I & G) v Whits (C C Ellis & Co)  
 CP 346 Morgan & arn (J Attenborough) v Wostenholme & arn (Lowless & Co)  
 Q B 347 Roy, Pritchard, & Co (J C Campbell) v Penney (J Hands)  
 Ex 348 Das son (Miller & Miller) v Grant & Clark & Puchard (Ashurst, M, & Co; Blunt, T & L)  
 CP 349 Claxton (C Smith) v Sutton & arn (Hicklin & W)  
 Ex 350 Arnold (Scott, J & T) v Landell (Collyer, B, W & R)  
 CP 351 Amazon Tug and Lighterage Co, limd (Ashurst, M & Co) v Laing (J W Hickin)  
 Q B 352 Cooper, Trustee, &c (Stibbard, G & C) v Neil (W Stopher)  
 Ex 353 Welsh Steam Coal Collieries Co, limd (Miller & M) v Gaskell (Few & Co) SJ  
 Q B 354 MacDonnell (Haywards, K & S) v Walker & arn (Mcree & M) SJ  
 CP 355 Rathbone & ors (Freshfields & W) v Caldwell (J B Towsle) SJ  
 Q B 356 Arnati & arn (Hollams, Son & C) v Gerich & Co (Linklater & Co) SJ  
 CP 357 Frandt & ors (W A Crump & Son) v Koegler (Plews & Co)  
 Q B 358 Hobbs (Noon & C) v London, Tilbury, & Southend Railway Co (Hollingworth & Co)  
 Q B 359 Hobbs, jun (Same) v Same (Same)  
 Q B 360 Fowler (Hollams, Son & C) v Stephens (Lowless & Co) SJ  
 Ex 361 Hunter (H C Nisbet & Co) v Steel & arn (Same)  
 Q B 362 Green & ors (H Kimber & Co) v Gowland & ors (Ellis & Crossfield; Underwood & Sons)  
 Ex 363 Learoyd (Learoyd & Co) v Latham & Co (H Woodward) SJ  
 Ex 364 Gammon (F Dollman) v Corporation of the Hall of Art & Sciences (Burchells)  
 CP 365 Weller (Trinder and Curtis-Hayward) v Churchill (Abbott & Co)  
 CP 366 Isaac (Digby & J) v Ellis (Blake & Snow)  
 CP 367 Smar (Lowless & Co) v Romanes (Jackson & P)  
 Q B 368 Weatherly (E Flux & L) v Duche (Pritchard & E) SJ  
 CP 369 Abrahams (Noon & C) v Mordecai (L Lewis)  
 Q B 370 Anderson, Anderson, & Co (Hollams, Son, & C) v Thom Stephen & Sons (Lowless & Co) SJ  
 CP 371 Luke Thomas & Co, limd (Markby, T, & S) v West, Duval, & Co (W S Fox) SJ  
 CP 372 Somerville & arn (E F B Harston) v Isaacs & arn (W H Roberts)  
 CP 373 Ottaway (In Person) v Hamilton (Mead & D)

C P 374 The Val de Travers Asphalte Paving Co, limd (Ellis & Crossfield) v North Met Tram Co (H C Godfray) SJ  
 Q B 375 De Bergue (Pritchard & Sons) v Tanner (Taylor, M, & T)  
 Q B 376 Leeky (Chorley & C) v Ward (Patey & W)  
 CP 377 Peters (Allin & G) v Lovejoy & arn (H S Austin)  
 Q B 378 The Northumberland Steam Shipping Co, limd, & ors (Flux & L) v Pairano (Lyne & H) SJ  
 Ex 379 Theodores Jones & Co (Terrell & H) v Woodward (Walborne & Son)  
 Q B 380 Mitchell (Brighton & P) v Roper (J H Lydall)

## PUBLIC COMPANIES.

June 29, 1877.

## GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 94½	Annuities, April, '88, 9½
Ditto for Account, 94½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
Do, 3 per Cent. Reduced, 94½	Ex Bills, £1000, 2½ per Ct. par.
New 3 per Cent., 94½	Ditto, £500, Do, par.
Do, 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £1000 & £200, par.
Do, 4 per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock. — per Ct. (last half-year), 261
Do, 5 per Cent., Jan. '78	Dittr for Account.
Annuities, Jan. '80	

## INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ind. Stk., 5 per Cent., July, '88, 104	Enf. Pr. 54 per Cent., May, '79, 9
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent.
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88, 102½	April, '64
Ditto, ditto, Certificates —	Do. Do, 5 per Cent., Aug. '73
Ditto Enforced Pr., 4 per Cent. 88	Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
2nd Enf. Pr., 5 per C., Jan. '72	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

## RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	—	
Stock Caledonian	100	123½	
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	102	
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	47	
Stock Great Northern	100	125	
Stock Do, A Stock*	100	127½	
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	125	
Stock Great Western—Original	100	100	
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	135	
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	112½	
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	202	
Stock London and North-Western	100	149½	
Stock London and South Western	100	131½	
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	72	
Stock Metropolitan	100	111	
Stock Do, District	100	47	
Stock Midland	100	122½	
Stock North British	100	92	
Stock North Eastern	100	154	
Stock North London	100	142	
Stock North Staffordshire	100	59	
Stock South Devon	100	62	
Stock South-Eastern	100	125	

\* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

## BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

## BIRTH.

TEMPLER—June 24, at Holm Cottage, Harrow, the wife of Frederic G. Templer, of the Inner Temple, of a son.

## MARRIAGES.

ALDRIDGE-PALMER—June 21, at All Saints', Benhilton, Sutton, Surrey, Alfred Frank Aldridge, of Fenchurch House, and Sutton, Surrey, solicitor, to Laura Mary Gilbert, daughter of the late William Palmer, of Stone Cot House, Sutton.

BOUTFLOWER-SAXON—June 21, at St. Margaret's, Bowdon, Edward Boutflower, solicitor, Manchester, to Mary Elizabeth, daughter of the late Wm. Saxon, C.E., The Castle, Northwich.

WRIGHT-GIBSON—June 16, at St. Mark's, Summer-hill, Birmingham, James Thomas Wright, solicitor, of London and Leicester, to Mrs. J. C. Gibson, widow of Dr. Gibson, of Driffield.

## DEATHS.

BAILY—June 19, at Stoney Hills, Esher, John Baily, Q.C., aged 72.

LE MOTTE—June 24, at the Vicarage, Helion, Bumpstead, Arthur James Le Motte, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, aged 29.

## LONDON GAZETTES.

## Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, June 26, 1877.

Curling, Robert, and Horatio Noble Fym, 3, Frederick's place, Old Jewry, London, Solicitors. June 23

## Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, June 22, 1877.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**Horrocks and Company, Limited.**—The M.R. has, by an order dated May 17, appointed John Adamsom, Norrill street, Manchester, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before July 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Tuesday, Aug 7, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

**Derlston Steel and Iron Company, Limited.**—The M.R. has, by an order dated May 28, appointed Alfred Ebenezer Woutham, Ann st, Birmingham, to be official liquidator

TUESDAY, June 26, 1877.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**Avonside Sugar Refinery Company, Limited.**—Petition for winding up, presented June 22, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on Friday, July 6. Whites and Co, Little Trinity lane, agents for Brittan and Co, Bristol, solicitors for the petitioners

**Fine Art Publishing Company, Limited.**—By an order made by the M.R., dated June 16, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Warington, Gresham buildings, solicitor for the petitioners

**London and Provincial Skating Rink Company, Limited.**—By an order made by the M.R., dated June 16, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Ashurst and Co, Old Jewry, solicitors for the petitioners

**Old Tauroch Leaf Mining Company, Limited.**—Petition for winding up, presented June 21, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon on Saturday, July 7. Chester and Co, Staple Inn, agents for Walker and Smith, Chester, solicitors for the petitioners

**Shirland Collieries Company, Limited.**—Petition for winding up, presented April 4, directed to be heard before the M.R. on July 7. Robinson and Prest, Lincoln's Inn fields, agents for Colborne and Ward, Newport, Mon., solicitors for the petitioner

## Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, June 22, 1877.

New Union Friendly Society, Hare and Hounds Inn, Wellington, Salop. June 16

TUESDAY, June 26, 1877.

St George's Loyal Union Benefit Society, Pied Horse, St George's, Gloucester. June 23

## Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, June 19, 1877.

Baily, Richard, Banbury, Oxford, Tailor. July 7. Baily v Harris, V.C. Hull, Crift, Bakersbury

Duck, George Francis, Down, Kent, Yeoman. July 14. Duck v Duck, V.C. Hull, Willett, Bromley

Ive, William, St Lawrence, co, Kent, Gent. July 18. Robinson v Shoobred, V.C. Hull, Smith and Son, Furnival's Inn

Lenny, Charles, North End, Croydon, Coach Builder. July 24. Lenny v Lenny, V.C. Hall, Harris and Powell, Essex st, Strand

Levy, Samuel, Longacre. July 10. Graygoose v Levy, V.C. Malins, Tilt yard, King's

Oxford, George, Bishopsgate st without, Saw Maker. July 17. Hart v Oxford, M.R. Foster, Burnawick sq

Sao Pdro (Brazil) Gas Company, Limited. Sept 7. Barry v The Sao Pdro (Brazil) Gas Company, Limited, M.R. Hopgood, Whitehall place

Wilton, Isabella, Paradise st, Marylebone, Chimney Sweep. July 2. Wilton v Lashmer, V.C. B. Con, Tisley, Alchurch yard

FRIDAY, June 22, 1877.

Hodges, Charles Mills, Budge, Knt, Butcher. July 26. Hewitt v Hodges, V.C. H. II. Sankey and Co, Canterbury

Marion, John, Hinckley, Middlesex, Fish Merchant. July 19. Lamb v Lamb, V.C. Bacon. Summerlin and Heritage, Saxe-lane, Queen Victoria st

Other, Christopher, jun, Richmond, York, Esq. July 21. Wright v Other, V.C. Hall, Teale, Leyburn

Scarborough, Thomas, Ravensthorpe, Westmoreland, Yeoman. July 30. Lindsay v Walfe, V.C. Malins

Stewart, Charles, Manchester, Merchant. Aug 1. Colville v Hamond, V.C. Hall, Bow and Coton, Chancery lane

Wilkins, Frederick George, Poplars, Leyton, Essex, Bullion Broker. July 21. Wilkins v Wilkins, V.C. Hall, Carey and Co, West-street, Finsbury circus

Wilkinson, Rev John, Broughton Gifford, Wiltz. July 20. Wilkinson v Prat, V.C. Malins. Awdry, Melashan

## Creditors under 22 &amp; 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, June 15, 1877.

Abrahams, Shenck Mackie, Dover. July 28. Claris, Dover Barton, Harold Wainwright, Liverpool, Captain Militia. Aug 8. Radcliffe and Smith, Liverpool

Bromage, Edward Henry, Monmouth, Bunker. July 31. Deakin, Monmouth

Brooke, Eliza Langford, Cheltenham, Gloucester. July 9. Bushard and Son, Southgate, York

Brown, William, Chad sley Corbett, Worcester, Esq. July 12. Harwards and Co, Stoofsbury, e

Bury, J. and Simpson, Blackpool, Lancashire, Gent. July 7. Grundy and Co, Manchester

Braga, Joao Joaquim de Carvalho, Braga, Portugal, Merchant. July 2. Crump and Son, Philpot lane

Chambers, Thomas, Chart-next-Sutton Valence, Kent, Yeoman. Aug 6. Monkton and Co, Maidstone

Cooke, Henry, Swinton, York, Manager. Aug 1. Harrop, Swinton, Rotherham

Downes, George, Streatham, Surrey. July 31. Hunter and Downes, Coleman st

Doyle, John O'Connell, Bahia, Merchant. July 21. Slater and Co, Manchester

Echals, Rev John Manuel, Appleby, Leicester. Aug 31. Paine and Co, Gresham House

Finlay, Ann, Sunderland, Durham. July 20. Thomas Steel, Sunderland

Firbank, Anne, Charlton-next-Woolwich, Kent. July 26. Diggles, Hibernia chambers, London bridge

Gardner, Maria, Hunstanton St Edmunds, Norfolk. July 20. Caton, Fakenham, Norfolk

Habberfield, John, Strode, Somerset, Yeoman. June 30. Perham, Wrington

Heginbottom, George, Southport, Lancashire, Esq. Sept 13. Brooks and Co, Ashton-under-Lyne

Hill, Thomas, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. Aug 1. Stevenson, Leicester

Hinde, George, Carlisle, Ironfounder. Aug 15. Clatterback and Trevanian, Carlisle

Hurst, Samuel, Manchester, Cotton Spinner. Aug 1. Hewitt, Manchester

Johnson, John Harrison, Liverpool, Chemist. July 18. Peacock and Cooper, Liverpool

Lacey, William Charles, Rylstone, Hants, Gent. July 30. Lacey and Son, Bourne End, Hants

Langton, George, Shiffield, Coachman. Aug 27. Taylor, Sheffield

Leech, Peter, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler. Aug 3. Kadcliff and Smith, Liverpool

Lievre, Sarah Ord, Pinner, Middlesex. Aug 1. Clayton and Son, Lancast place, Strand

Lomer, Wilson, Elvaston place, South Kensington, Esq. July 18. Newman, Southampton

Maxton, Peter, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Shipowner. July 24. Nash and Field, Queen st

Mello, Arnold, Brighton, Sussex, Esq. July 20. Trollope and Winstow, Abingdon, Westminster

Miller, Thomas, Leicester, Gent. Aug 6. Harry, Leicester

Richards, J. James, Smallwood, Seymour st, Finsbury sq, Esq. Oct 1. Webster, Fornival's inn

Ryde, Charles Fresco, Close, Stafford, Lieut R.N. July 6. Davison and Burch, Spring gardens

Salter, Thomas, Milner st, Islington, Gent. Aug 30. Fielder and Sumner, Gilmerton st, Doctors' commons

Samuel, Edwin Louis, Kensington gore, Banker. July 28. Hill and Son, Old Broad st

Shaw, Mary, Torkington, Cheshire. July 20. Lingards and Newby, Manchester

Summeress, George, Low Walker, Northumberland, Grocer. July 21. Bird, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Thompson, Joseph, Monkwearmouth Shore, Durham, Gent. Aug 1. Thomas Steel, Sunderland

Waite, James, Shanklin, Isle of Wight, Dairyman. Aug 1. Mew and Hooper, Shanklin

Wo d, Charlotte, Kingswood, Warwick. July 23. Sanders and Smith, Birmingham

Woodcock, John Newell, Littleton-in-Liversedge, York, Gent. July 31. Lancaster and Wright, Bradford

TUESDAY, June 19, 1877.

Andrews, John, Worcester, Builder. July 27. Corbett Braund, Thomas, Bordesley park, Willesden lane, Milliner. July 31. Allen and Son, Caroline st, Soho sq

Brailsford, Sophia, Cramhall, Gloucester. July 30. Cumberland, British Brooks, Ann Lucke, Stoke, Devon. Aug 30. Gard, Devonport

Brooks, Emma S. ran, Stoke-on-Trent, Devon. Aug 20. Gard, Devonport

Carlton, Mary, Beachfield, Lancashire. July 24. Wood and Co, Manchester

Carter, Josher, Coventry, Licensed Victualler. July 23. Lewes and Co, Coventry

Cover, Robert, Redhill, Surrey, Esq. July 28. Meynell, Castle st, Holborn

Dale, Richard, Ford, Hants, Yeoman. July 14. Drury, jun, Bournemouth

Dennison, Isabella, Southport, Lancashire. Aug 14. Field and Weightman, Liverpool

Dowsworth, Edward, York, Coach Builder. July 14. Dent, York

Field, Elizabeth Isabella, Bath, Somerset. July 10. Little, Bath

Ford, Thomas, Ardwick, Manchester, Gent. July 31. Chapman and C, Manchester

Gibson, John W. envelope, Withington Hall, Cheshire, Esq. July 22. Brown and Rogers, Chester

Greaves, George, Sheffield, Engineer. Aug 1. Binney and Sons, Sheffield

Greene, William, Titchfield, Hants, Esq. July 31. Wilkinson, George

Grindrod, Mary Jane, Harringay, York. Aug 1. Hirst and Co, Harrogate

Gurney, Thomas, Amersham, Bucks, Farmer. July 28. Rutter and Son, Pinbury circus

Hardwick, William, Sandford, Hereford, Farmer. July 20. Danse, Ross

Hedgeman, James, Elm Bank, Surrey. July 31. Morley and Shirreff, Pa-mansion buildings, Old Broad st

James, George, Ridgeway, Hants, Esq. Aug 11. Brady and Co, Gresham House

Johnston, John Harrison, Liverpool, Chemist. July 18. Peacock and Cooper, Liverpool

Jones, Edward, Ucheldre, Montgomery, Farmer. July 14. Talbot and Co, Newtown, Montgomery

Kemp, Alice, Monkwearmouth Shore, Durham. Aug 8. Wilford, Sunderland

Marshall, Elizabeth, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Aug 1. Leitch and Co, North Shields

Midgey, Sarah, Bowdon, Cheshire. July 31. Nicol and Co, Lime st  
Pichforth, Abraham Crow-h-r, Elland, York, Gent. July 18. Chambers and Chambers, B-uh n<sup>e</sup>  
Pichforth, Mary Ann, Elland, York. July 15. Chambers and Chambers, B-uh n<sup>e</sup>  
Port, Elizabeth, Wilton crescent, Knightsbridge. July 18. Bircham and Co, Parliament st, Westminster  
Raphael, John, Hampton, Esq. Aug 15. Travers and Co, Throgmorton st  
Richards, Roger Charnock, Preston, Lancashire, Esq. July 12. Charnock and Finch, Preston  
Ruel, William James, High Holborn, Clerk. July 2. Cox, Claremont  
Scott, Sack Noy, St Austell, Cornwall, Attorney's Clerk. Aug 18.  
Carlyon and Stephens, St Austell  
Ugley, William, Newt n Abbot, Devon, Silversmith. July 2. Beachy, Newton Anto.  
Van Tuyl, Maria Jane, Leek, Stafford. July 17. Killmister and Proctor, Maclellan id  
Walker, William, Huddersfield, York, Pawnbroker. July 1. Alaley, Huddersfield  
Watt, Richard, N rhumberland st, Strand, Hotel Proprietor. July 21. Bonner, King William

## Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, June 22, 1877.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Coper, William John, Charlotte st, Fitzroy sq. Pet Feb 27. Hazlitt, July 4 at 12  
Covendale, John, New Kent rd, Grocer. Pet June 19. Brougham, July 9 at 11  
Dennis, J. Joseph, Albert terrace, Knightsbridge, Tailor. Pet June 18.  
Brougham. July 3 at 11  
Peter, William Henry, Nunhead, Licensed Victualler. Pet June 20.  
Spring-dice. July 3 at 1

To Surrender in the Country.

Gabley, William Henry, Kilmse, York, Farm Servant. Pet June 19.  
Bolith, Kingston-upon-Hull, July 5 at 3  
Wright, Bichar, and Jess. Wright, Fairweather green, York, Yarn Finishers. Pet June 18. Lee, Bradford. July 6 at 9

TUESDAY, June 26, 1877.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Gordon, Allan, Chepstow villa, Baywater, no occupation. Pet June 22. Ke ne. July 9 at 11.30  
Michael, James, Rattry rd, Brixton, Jeweller's Factor. Pet June 22. Kene. June 9 at 12  
Red, Thomas Edwin, Battersea park rd, Butcher. Pet June 21. Pepys. July 11 at 12  
To Surrender in the Country.  
Gallow, John Thomas, an. John Thomas Smith, Fletton, Huntingdon, Corn Merchant. Pet June 21. Gache, Peterborough, July 7 at 11. Hobey, J-mes, Leicester, Publican. Pet June 21. Ingram, Leicester, July 5 at 12  
Joy, Thomas Jonah, Great Clacton, Essex, Grocer. Pet June 20. Barnes, Colchester, July 18 a. 3  
Kinnis, John, St Leonards, Sussex, Dyer. Pet June 23. Young. Hastings, July 7 at 12  
Marry, Smith, Leicester, Leather Factor. Pet June 21. Ingram, Leicester, July 9 at 12  
Selton, Mary Josephine, Handsworth, Stafford. Pet June 23. Cole, Birmingham, July 6 at 3  
Woodhal, Thomas Al red, Houghton-le-Spring, Durham, Chain Manufacturer. Pet June 23. Marshall, Houghton-le-Spring, July 18 at 11

## BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, June 26, 1877.

Marshall, William Henry, Durham, Solicitor. June 18

## Liquidations by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, June 29, 1877.

Baddiley, Elizabeth, Preston, Ironmonger. July 4 at 2 at the Shelley's Arms Hotel, Fishergate, Preston. Quillifre and Watson, Preston  
Barrett, Char es H-r, Harv ch, E-ex, Brasier, July 9 at 12 at offices of W-t-s, Buttermeat, Ipswich  
Bald n, James, Wreford, Yarn Manufacturer. July 2 at 11 at offices of Gill and Hall, Silver st, Wakefield  
Bell, Richard Morton, Jewin, A-cin-ee-ner. July 2 at 12.30 at offices of Buncle and R ger, Basinghill st  
Bennett, Elizabeth, Middle Hall Station, Lancashire, Innkeeper. July 3 at 3 at offices of Spencer, Whinckley sq, Preston  
Berger, Leo, Philpot lane, Merchant. July 12 at 3 at offices of Lumley and Lumley, Old Jewry chambers  
Bickley, William G-orw, Capthorne rd, Clapham, Biscuit Baker. July 5 at 1 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Anning, Cheapside  
Bilton, James, Hillside, Swans-s, Engineer. July 3 at 3 at offices of Gloucester, Fisher st, Swans-s  
Bott, Arthur Jeremiah, Thre e Col t, Limehouse, Shipping Butcher. July 6 at 11 at Mullin's Hotel, Ironmonger lane, Cheapside  
Budbrook, Albert, Jewin st, Perfumer. July 2 at 10.30 at offices of Parker and Boranum, Chancery lane  
Budden, John, Birmingham, Ironmonger. July 6 at 3 at offices of Boller and Bickley, Bennett's hill, Birmingham  
Brennan, William, Ponesbury, Sale, Butcher. July 7 at 11 at offices of Brughall, St John's hill, Sh-w-bury  
Bever, Horace, Northgate, Darlington, Actor. June 30 at 10.30 at offices of Burton, Union passage, Birmingham  
Cawell, John, Liveredge, York, Merchant. July 9 at 11 at offices of Cury, Cleckheaton  
Cribb, William, Kimberley, Nottingham, Builder. July 9 at 12 at offices of Fraser, Wheelerhouse, Nottingham  
Charles, William, and Charles F de le Atkinson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Eat House Keepers. July 12 at 11 at offices of Komyshe and Ferrier, St John's chamber, Granger at west, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Clark, William, London wall, Furnishing Ironmonger. July 4 at 2 at offices of Roche, Old Jewry  
Coaten, Henry, March, Isle of Ely, Grocer. July 6 at 1 at the Griffin Hotel, March, Wise, March  
Cook, Samuel, Hackthorne, Lincoln, Carrier. July 7 at 11 at offices of Page, jun., Faxonate, Lincoln  
Cotton, Alfred, Bedford, Hat Manufacturer. July 9 at 2 at offices of Mitchell and Webb, Guildford st, Luton  
Doughty, Charles, Great Yarmouth, Currier. July 5 at 2 at offices of Steele, College hill, Costerton, Great Yarmouth  
Downs, William, Great Dover at Southwark, Ironmonger. July 6 at 12 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Gracehill, Gracechurch st  
Duff, Bernard, Jarrold, Durham, Beer-eller. July 6 at 10.30 at Bell's Neville Hotel, Nevile, Newcastle. Cox, Westgate, York  
Farmer, John, Thatcham, Berks, Miller. July 6 at 3 at offices of Denton and Co, Gray's inn sq  
Fawcett, James, Liversedge, York, Blanket Manufacturer. July 5 at 3 at the Wickham Arms Hotel, Railway Station, Mirfield, Learyd and Co, Hud-sfeld  
Fearnley, Arthur Samuel, Pye bank, Sheffield, Hosiery. July 6 at 11 at offices of Brook and Co, Haymarket chambers, Old Haymarket, Sheffield  
Frampton, Robert Christopher, Somerfield rd, Finsbury park, Auctioneer. July 9 at 3 at 9, King Edward st, Newgate st, Miles French, William Lonsdale, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Engineer. June 25 at 2 at offices of Sewell, Gray st, Newcas le-upon-Tyne  
Fry, William, Birton, Gloucester, Grocer. July 3 at 11 at offices of Atchley, Clare st, Bristol  
Fryer, Ralph, Bolton, Cabinet Maker. July 4 at 11 at offices of Gooden, Mawdsley st, Bolton  
Gardener, Frederick, Duncan terrace, Islington, Warehouseman. July 12 at 3 at 173, Bal's Pond rd, Islington. Cooper, Chancery lane  
George, Henry, Bedford, Draper. July 9 at 12 at offices of Conquest and Clark, Henry st, Bedford  
George, Peter William, Monmouth, Tailor. July 6 at 2 at offices of Williams, Whit-cross st, Monmouth  
Gibbs, Bryce, Shrop st, Draper. July 6 at 12 at offices of Fernell, St James's st, Sheffield  
Goodon, Alfred, Peacock, Assistant Manuf Cutter. July 6 at 12 at offices of Oldershaw, King's Arm's yard, Moorgate st  
Goodyear, Samuel William, To-r, D-von, Grocer. July 10 at 11 at offices of Carter and Son, Cary building, Abbey rd, Torquay  
Greene, William Spence, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, General Broker. July 9 at 11 at offices of Kemyshe and Forster, St John's chamber, Grainger at west, Newcas le-upon-Tyne  
Gregg, Peter William, Mile End rd, Confectioner. June 30 at 10 at 152, Westminster bridge rd, Govt  
Hallett, Evans, Gibert st, Oxford st, Herbalist. June 29 at 2 at offices of MacMullin, St Martin's court, Lice-ter sq  
Hargraves, James Halliday, and Wm. Hargraves, Burley, York, Builders. July 4 at 3 at offices of Edison, Albion st, Leeds  
Hands, Stephen, Birmingham, Chairmaker. July 3 at 3 at offices of Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham  
Harrison, William, Great Moor-hom, York, Builder. July 2 at 3 at offices of Bates, Zetland rd, Middleborough, Hornbeam, Great Moor-hom  
Hawkins, Joseph Millington, Birmingham, Manufacturing Jeweller. July 5 at 1 at offices of Blewitt, Waterloo st, Birmingham  
Hawkins, Alred, Great Coll g-st, Cam le town, Cheesemonger. July 3 at 3 at offices of Lewis, Hat on garden, Holborn  
Hennessy, Ignatius Albert, Drury lane, Grocer. July 10 at 11 at offices of Parke, Strand  
Hepworth, Elijah, Kirkgate, York, Bootmaker. July 5 at 3 at the Royal Hotel, Wood st, Wakefield. Horn-r, Wakefield  
Hibbard, Charles, Hilperton, Wiltz, Butcher. July 2 at 12 at offices of Rowday, Fo e st, Trowbridge  
Hunting, John, Cambridge, Licensed Victualler. July 4 at 2 at offices of Gaches, Cathedral gateway, Peter rough  
Huntley, John, Halifax, Umbrella Maker. July 4 at 11 at offices of Longbottom, No 14a, chambers, Halifax  
Ireland, James, Manchester, Cotton Waste Merchant. July 11 at 3 at offices of Leigh, Brown st, Manchester  
Islam, Samual, Rochdale, Licensed Victualler. July 6 at 3 at offices of Standring, King st, South Parade, Rochdale  
Jackson, John James, Ro alp, M ddle-er, Blacksmith. July 9 at 3 at the George Inn, Uxbridge, Philip Hayes  
Jackson, Moses, Barrow-in-Furness, Clog hir. June 28 at 2 at the Imperial Hotel, Cornwallis st, Barrow-in-Furness. Nalder, Barrow-in-Furness  
Jackson, Robert, Gateshead, Durham, out of business. July 2 at 11 at offices of Purdy, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
Jackson, William E ward, Halifax, Fancy Dealer. July 5 at 3 at offices of Burrell and Pickard, Albion st, Leeds. Brown, Leeds  
Jebson, John, Jun, Skelmersdale, Wyrk, Shirt Manufacturer. July 6 at 3 at offices of Berry, Market place, Hudd r-field  
Johnson, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Rope Manufactur. July 2 at 2 at offices of Newell, Green st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
Jones, David, Abs-er, with, Carrigan, J-ner. July 7 at 12 at offices of Jones, Great Dart gate st, Aberystwyth  
Kelet, Moses, A-ham-on-Ly e, Utton, Waste Dealer. July 9 at 3 at offices of Brooks and Co, Brown st, Manchester  
Kibler, George, Aveston, Warwick, Builder. July 11 at 1 at the Falcon Hotel, Stratford-upon-Avon. Lane, Stratford-upon-Avon  
Lawrence, Jo-eph, Birmingham, Machinist. July 4 at 3 at offices of Lowe, Temple st, Birmingham  
Lightfoot, Booth, Wh t n, Cheshire, Grocer. July 9 at 10 at offices of Cooke and Cooke, Winsford, Cheshire  
Linter, Matilda, Georgia, Ge-port, Hants, Licensed Victualler. July 3 at 3 at offices o Duke, Unser st, Portsea  
Long, Henry Andrew, Greenhead, Kent, Grocer's Assistant. July 4 at 3 at the Flou'r de Ly Hotel, Canterbury, Till, Canterbury  
Lord, William, Heywood, Lancashire, Coal Merchant. July 3 at 4 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester  
Miles, George, Hampton Lucy, Warwick, Shoemaker. July 6 at 12 at offices of Sanderson, Church st, Warwick  
Matthews, Thomas Mathew, Harris, Wootton Bassett, Wiltz, no occupation. July 3 at 1 at the Angel Hotel, Wootton Bassett  
Barnes, Swindon, Wiltz

Mead, Lewis, Newton Nethercote, Leicester, Brickmaker. July 5 at 11 at offices of Dewes and Musson, Abby-de-la-Zouch, Leicester  
 Mellard, Joseph, Rugeley, Ironmonger. July 4 at 11 at offices of Sheldon, Lower High st, Wednesbury  
 Mellor, Arthur, Huddersfield, Butcher. July 3 at 3 at offices of Ainsley, New st, Huddersfield  
 Middlemore, William, Wal-all, Stafford, Beer Retailer. July 3 at 11 at offices of Gowler, Park st, Walsall  
 Monthe, William, Frederik, Swansea, Glamorgan, Broker's Clerk. July 5 at 12 at the Vivian Arms, Ferry-side, Wind st, Swanes. John Newby, James, Bradford, Poultry Dealer. July 11 at 11 at offices of Hutchinson, Piccadilly, Bradford  
 Norbury, Joseph, Cheadle, Lancashire, Boot Maker. July 5 at 11 at offices of Gould, Princess st, Manchester  
 Partridge, Robert, Newton Abbot, Devon, Draper. July 6 at 3.20 at Merton's Commercial Hotel, Newton Abbot, Devon. Watts Parker, William Lovell, Handsworth, Stafford, Clerk. June 29 at 11 at offices of Walter, Ann st, Birmingham  
 Parkes, Howard Charles, Coleman st, Accountant. July 10 at 12 at offices of Nathaniel and Co, Newhall st, Birmingham. Newman and Co, Cornhill  
 Peacock, Robert Thomas, Coatham, York, Grocer. July 5 at 11 at offices of Robon, Linthorpe rd, Middlesbrough  
 Pegg, Charles, Smethwick, Stafford, Draper. July 5 at 11 at offices of Simmone's Bennett's Hill, Birmingham  
 Peter, William, Halesowen, Worcester, Grocer. June 29 at 11 at offices of Wall, Union chambers, Stourbridge, Worcester  
 Pouson, John, Leytonstone, Builder. July 4 at 2 at offices of Allen and Edwards, Old Jewry  
 Presto, Thomas, Westgate, York, Tailor. July 5 at 11 at offices of Bot onley, New st, Huddersfield  
 Pullin, James, Bolton, Lancashire, Music Hall Proprietor. July 5 at 3 at offices of Ryley and Haslam, Mawdley st, Bolton  
 Richardson, Charles, and David Cur, Bury, Lancashire, Jute Spinners. July 3 at 3 at offices of Addlesham and Warburton, King st, Manchester  
 Roberts, Evan, Swansea, Commission Agent. July 3 at 12 at offices of Williams, Abbey terrace, Llandilo, Carmarthenshire  
 Robinson, William, Alfred Robinson, and Arthur Robinson, Newton, Cheshire, Builders. July 5 at 12 at offices of Hibbert, Clarendon place, Hyde  
 Rose, John, and Robert Rowden, Exeter, Carvers. July 3 at 3 at offices of Friend, Post Office chamber, Exeter  
 Russell, J. Ferry, Malmesbury, Wilt., Builder. July 4 at 3 at the King's Arms Hotel, Malmesbury, Blake, Malmesbury, Wilt.  
 Sadi, Alfred William, East Dereham, Norfolk, Brush Manufacturer. June 29 at 4 at offices of Stanley, Bank street, Norwich  
 Shene, Walter John, Mile End rd, Schoolmaster. July 6 at 4 at offices of Willis, Charles sq, Hoxton  
 Shotton, John Fenwick, Blyth, Northumberland, Boot Manufacturer. June 29 at 12.30 at offices of Wilson, Featherstone chambers, Colliewood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
 Simpson, Henry, Widnes, Lancashire, Draper. July 5 at 2 at offices of Norden and Mason, Victoria st, Liverpool  
 Spencer, William Beau-land, Halifax, Woolen Waste Dealer. July 6 at 11 at offices of Shaw, Crown st chambers, Halifax  
 Spicer, Lot, Milton Abbas, Dorset, Miller. July 7 at 12.30 at the Junction Hotel, Dorchester, Dorset. Lock and Son  
 Stallard, James, Bristol, Beer Retailer. June 30 at 11 at offices of Essey, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol  
 Sydenham, Joseph, and John Sydenham, Worship st, Finsbury, Upholsterers. July 9 at 2 at offices of Boyce and Ridley, Abchurch lane  
 Taylor, Charles, Birmingham, Stationer. July 6 at 12 at offices of Hawkes and Week-, Temple st, Birmingham  
 Taylor, Joseph, Darlaston, Stafford, Boat Builder. July 5 at 11 at offices of E-House, Mount Pleasant, Bilston  
 Taylor, Robert Nathaniel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Tin Plate Merchant. July 11 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland  
 Thomas, Edward, Abergavenny, Monmouth, Grocer. July 5 at 12 at offices of Collins, Jun, Broad st, Bristol. Vaughan, Newport, Mon  
 Tozer, William Henry, Bristol, Cabinet Maker. July 2 at 11 at offices of Hancock, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol  
 Vaughan, John, Mumbles, Glamorgan, Painter. July 3 at 3 at offices of Beer, Gloucester place, Swansea  
 Venner, George, Ford, Somerset, Butter Factor. June 28 at 11 at offices of Reed and Cook, Paul st, Taunton  
 Vickery, Joseph, Harborne, Stafford, Grocer. July 5 at 12 at offices of Lowe, Newhall st, Birmingham  
 Wake, William, Goole, York, Ship Builder. July 10 at 3 at offices of Hind, Goole  
 Wallace, Robert, St Helen's, Lancashire, Boot Manufacturer. July 6 at 3 at offices of Mather, Commerce court, Liverpool. Barrow and Cook, St Helen's, Lancashire  
 Webster, Richard, New Brighton, Cheshire, Insurance Agent. July 5 at 11 at the Ranleigh Hotel, Chester st, Birkenhead  
 Wenney, John, Clee, Lincoln, Fish Salesman. July 11 at 11 at offices of Grange and Wintingham, St Mary's chambers, West St Mary's gate, Great Grimsby  
 West, Ainsworth, Buckley, Flint, Machine Dealer. July 3 at 2 at the Angel Hotel, Dale st, Liverpool. Roper  
 White, J. in Harry, Tavistock, Devon, Spirit Merchant. July 4 at 12 at offices of Bridgman, Church lane, Tavistock  
 Whittle, William Thomas, Manchester, Quilt Manufacturer. July 6 at 3 at offices of Hankinson, St James's sq, Manchester  
 Wild, Edmund, Manchester, Yarn Polisher. July 3 at 3 at the Waterloo Hotel, Piccadilly, Manchester. Vaughan-Jones, Manchester  
 Williams, Charles McTaggart, Fillongley, Warwick, Colliery Contractor. July 12 at 12.30 at the Bull Hotel, Nuneaton. Hughes and Masser, C ventry  
 Withnell, William, Weaverthorpe, York, Butcher. July 7 at 10.30 at the New Globe Inn, Maltby, York. Williamson, Scarborough  
 Womersley, Thomas, Scholes, York, Boot Maker. July 14 at 12 at offices of Scholesfield and Taylor, Northgate, Cleckheaton  
 Woodward, Frederick George, Bath, Stationer. June 29 at 12 at 1, at offices of Crutwell, Harrington place, Bath

TUESDAY, June 26, 1877.

Arnall, Thomas Tuck, and Thomas Arnall, Redruth, Cornwall, Wire Merchants. July 9 at 2 at offices of Paul, Quay st, Truro. Peter Redruth  
 Baker, Elizabeth, Wolverhampton, Grocer. July 10 at 3 at offices of Willcock, Queen's chambers, North st, Wolverhampton  
 Balderton, William, Spilsby, Lincoln, Merchant. July 12 at 11 at the Yarborough Hotel, Great Grimsby. Bell, Louth  
 Batten, James William, Sonning, Berks, Builder. July 10 at 3 at the Upper Ship Hotel, Duke st, Reading. Beale and Martin, Reading  
 Benning, Albert Frederic, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. July 6 at 3 at offices of Johnston, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
 Bickerton, Richard, Oldham, Lancashire, Brickmaker. July 11 at 11 at offices of Rylands and Barker, Essex st, Manchester  
 Billingham, Frederick Joseph, Leeds, Boot Manufacturer. July 6 at 3 at offices of Roake and Midgley, White Horse st, Boar lane, Leeds  
 Blake, John, Bridgend, Glamorgan, Colliery Manager. July 10 at 10.30 at the Grand Hotel, Bristol. David, Newport, Mon  
 Block, Aaron, Great St. Andrew st, Bloomsbury, Curiosity Dealer. July 16 at 3 at offices of Myer, New Bridge st, Blackfriars  
 Booth, Thomas, and John Thomas Booth, Rochdale, Cotton Spinners. July 11 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral gates, Hanging Ditch, Manchester  
 Brun, John, Royston, York, Publican. July 9 at 11 at offices of Gray, Eliza st, Barnsley  
 Burgess, Peter, Macclesfield, Tea Dealer. July 20 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester  
 Burton, Joseph, Liverpool, Butcher. July 14 at 11 at offices of Lowe, Castle st, Liverpool  
 Cakewell, Thomas, Sulgrave, Northampton, Stone Mason. July 9 at 12 at offices of Whitehorn, High st, Banbury, Oxford  
 Carr, Will, and Matison, Crook, Durham, Innkeeper. July 9 at 4 at offices of Miltoun, Crook  
 Cleave, Horatio, Leicester, Timber Merchant. July 9 at 3 at offices of Hunter, Halford st, Leicester  
 Clemont, Joshua, Rechdale, Grocer. July 3 at 4 at the Albion Hotel, Piccadilly, Manchester. Roberts  
 Cross, John, Preston, Brickmaker. July 9 at 11 at offices of Thompson, Lane st, Preston  
 Crundell, Walter John, Leominster, Watchmaker. July 11 at 3 at offices of Moore, Corn sq, Leominster  
 Daniell, Mary Charlotte, Manchester, Fancy Goods Dealer. July 6 at 3 at offices of Fox, Princes st, Manchester  
 Deane, Daniel, Smethwick, Stafford, out of business. July 11 at 11 at offices of Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury  
 Dickin-son, Joseph, Norton, York, Shoemaker. July 6 at 11 at offices of Barlif, Market place, Malton  
 Dyson, John, Huddersfield, Chemical Manufacturer. July 11 at 11 at offices of Johnson and Crook, Market walk, Huddersfield  
 Eastham, James, Preston, Grocer. July 10 at 3 at offices of Ambler, Cannon st, Preston  
 Edmonds, Jubal Henry, Fenchurch st, Accountant. July 10 at 12 at offices of Rogers and Chave, Queen Victoria st  
 Faulkner, George, Jun, Astor-juxta-Birmingham, Bootmaker. July 9 at 3 at offices of James, Temple st, Birmingham  
 Fenney, Hubert William, Wolverhampton, General Dealer. July 4 at 11 at offices of Stratton and Rudland, Queen st, Wolverhampton  
 Fletcher, Francis, Green, Licensed Victualler. July 10 at 2 at offices of Bishop, What st, Green  
 Forster, Joseph, Over D-rwen, Painter. July 6 at 11 at the Old Bull Hotel, Blackburn, Costeaker, Over Darwen  
 France, James, Dewsbury, Carpet Manufacturer. July 4 at 3 at the Royal Hotel, Dewsbury  
 Fryer, Henry, Wakefield, General Ironmonger. July 10 at 11.30 at offices of K-Mp, Barrow sq, Wakefield  
 Galway, William, Bradford, Corver. July 7 at 11 at offices of Layton and Jaques, Ely place, Holborn. Singleton, Bradford  
 Gentry, George, Preston, Reed Manufacturer. July 9 at 2.30 at offices of Edsall, Winslow st, Preston  
 Goodson, Thomas, Baltonborough, Somerset, Yeoman. July 11 at 11 at offices of Holman and Bith, Glastonbury  
 Gray, Thomas, Croydon, Engineer. July 9 at 10.30 at offices of Ambrose and Co, Dovercourt, Temple  
 Green, Sepimus, Great Budlow, Essex, Butcher. July 11 at 11 at offices of Blith, Chisford  
 Gregory, Hannah Emma, Arundell st, Coventry st, Haymarket, Hotel Proprietor. July 9 at 3 at 4, Arundell st, Coventry st, Haymarket, Cavell  
 Griffiths, James William, Dartmouth, Baker. July 9 at 12 at the Castle Hotel, New Quay, Dartmouth. Pearse, Plymouth  
 Gunn, John, Nottingham, out of business. July 6 at 12 at offices of Belk, Middle way, Nottingham  
 Hawksworth, Charles Owen, Leeds, Plumber. July 9 at 11 at offices of Malcolm, Park row, Leeds  
 Hewitt, Haddon, Tenbury, Worcester, Builder. July 6 at 12.30 at the Corn Exchange Hall, Tenbury. Norris and Miles, Tenbury  
 Hitchcock, Augustus, Landport, Hants, Coal Merchant. July 10 at 4 at Totterell's Hotel, St George's sq, Portsea  
 Horton, Richard, N rmanston Common, York, Shopkeeper. July 6 at 11 at offices of Lake, Southgate, Wakefield  
 Horwood, James Henry, Gib-on sq, Islington, Metal Merchant. July 6 at 3 at offices of Payne, Serjeants' inn, Temple  
 Humphreys, Richard Will-m, Tranmere, Cheshire, Gasfitter. July 7 at 11 at offices of Downham, Hamilton sq, Birkenhead  
 James, John, Birmingham, Excavator. July 6 at 11 at offices of Eaden, Bennett's hill, Birrell, Cheshire  
 Joseph, Morris, Leeds, Hat Manufacturer. July 11 at 3 at offices of Brooke, Bond st, Leeds  
 Kaufmann, Adolph, Crown court, Threadneedle st, Star and Garter, Neal  
 16 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Neal

Woop, Nathaniel, Hyde, Cheshire, Hat Manufacturer. July 10 at 11 at offices of Vaughan and Sons, Tiviot Dale, Heaton Norris, Lancashire.  
 Knight, William Augustus, Birmingham, Butcher. July 6 at 3 at offices of Rowlands, Ann st., Birmingham.  
 Laird, Richard, Cliftonville, Engineer. July 11 at 2 at offices of Harrisons, Fowkes buildings, Great Tower st.  
 Lamb, Edward, Liverpool, Grocer. July 10 at 3 at offices of Roos and Price, North John st., Liverpool.  
 Lee, Charles, Manchester, Wholesale Dealer. July 11 at 11 at the Falstaff Hotel, Market place, Manchester. Whitehead, Manchester.  
 Leighton, John, Chap, Westmoreland, Butcher. July 9 at 2.30 at offices of Arnison, St. Andrew's place, Penrith, Cumberland.  
 Lewis, John Walter, Tredgar, Mon., Carpenter. Jul 6 at 11 at offices of Harris, Morgan st., Tredgar.  
 Lord, William, Leeds, Linen Manufacturer. July 10 at 3 at offices of Simpson and Burrell, Albion st., Leeds.  
 Lumley, Anthony, Leeds, Butcher. July 9 at 2 at offices of Markland and Davy, Albion st., Leeds.  
 Martin, Emily, Swansea, Licensed Victualler. July 6 at 3 at offices of Giacalone, Fisher st., Swansea.  
 Mathias, Benjamin, Swansea, Hosiery. July 5 at 3 at offices of Glasco-dine, Fisher st., Swansea.  
 Maynard, William, Banwell, Somerset, Baker. July 10 at 2 at offices of Selmon and Henderson, Broad st., Bristol.  
 Malmish, Joshua, Newtown, Bristol, Butcher. July 4 at 12 at offices of Meers, Nicholas st., Bristol.  
 Mensies, James, Kingston-upon-Hull, Draper. July 4 at 3 at offices of Singleton, Exchange Buildings, Bowalley lane, Kingston-upon-Hull.  
 Miles, Charles Henry, Leighton rd., Kentish town, House Decorator. July 5 at 3 at offices of Moore, Bedford row, Holborn.  
 Miles, Thomas, Oldham, Cotton Spinner. July 2 at 3 at offices of Ascroft and Sons, Clerg st., Oldham.  
 Money, Frederick John, Brighton, Doctor of Medicine. July 10 at 12 at 167a, North st., Brighton.  
 Normington, William Emmett, Huddersfield, Confectioner. July 9 at 3 at offices of Ainley, New st., Huddersfield.  
 Ollert, Frederick, Rainham, Kent, Grocer. July 4 at 3 at offices of Hubbard and Co., Bucklersbury.  
 Parkes, Noah, jun., Oldbury, out of business. July 9 at 11 at offices of Shakespeare, Church st., Oldbury.  
 Peters, Alexander, Pembroke Dock, Grocer. July 9 at 10.15 at the Saracen's Head Hotel, Temple gate, Bristol. Parry, Pembroke Dock.  
 Pocock, Joshua, Holt, Wilts, Farmer. July 9 at 11 at offices of Foley and Son, The Mart, Mansvers st., Trowbridge.  
 Peplin, Jeni Peter, Middlesborough, General Merchant. July 7 at 12 at the Turk's Head Hotel, Newcastle-upon-Tees. Fawcett, Stockton-on-Tees.  
 Prax, David, Manchester, Tailor. July 2 at 3 at offices of Sampson, South King st., Manchester.  
 Pring, Henry Burgoynes, Newport, Mon., Coal Merchant. July 7 at 12 at offices of Vaughan, Deck st., Newport.  
 Pritchard, George, Chester, Coal Merchant. July 7 at 3 at offices of Ellis, Eastgate st., Chester.  
 Proser, Thomas Nuttall, Coventry, Manufacturing Fancy Stationer. July 9 at 11 at offices of Seymour, St. Mary's st., Coventry.  
 Rafter, John, Sal福德, Lamp Dealer. July 12 at 3 at offices of Law, Bridgfield, Manchester.  
 Reynoldson, Enoch, Darlaston, Stafford, Provision Dealer. July 11 at 11 at offices of Corbett, Penfold st., Darlaston.  
 Ring, Joseph, Southampton, Tailor. July 10 at 3 at offices of Killiby, Portland st., Southampton.  
 Robinson, E.iza, Dewsbury, Draper. July 18 at 2.30 at offices of Stapleton Union st., D.ewsbury.  
 Russel, William, Huddersford, Stafford, Draper. July 9 at 11 at Station st., Huddersford.  
 Sagar, Azron, Gateshead, Clothier. July 10 at 2 at offices of Jeols, Newcastle st., Newcastle-upon-Tyne.  
 Scattergood, Henry, Lancaster, Mechanic. July 11 at 3 at offices of Anderson, Garden st., Bury.  
 Scofield, Jacob, Radford, Nottingham, Miner. July 10 at 12 at offices of Bell, Middle pavement, Nottingham.  
 Sedgwick, Leonard, Sedbergh, York, Butcher. July 10 at 12 at the White Hart Inn, Sedbergh. Robinson, Sedbergh.  
 Seed, William Henry, Scarborough, Music Hall Proprietor. July 3 at the George Hotel, Market st., Bradford, in lieu of the place originally named.  
 Siddron, James, Dewsbury, Grocer. July 11 at 2.30 at offices of Stapleton, Union st., Dewsbury.  
 Skoulding, Francis, Knodhill-hall, Suffo'k, Miller. July 9 at 2 at the White Hart Inn, Saxmundham. Pollard, Ipswich.  
 Smifit, James, Wakefield, Draper. July 7 at 11 at offices of Gill and Hall, Silver st., Wakefield.  
 Smith, James, Friskney, Lincoln, Farmer. July 6 at 11 at offices of Dyer, Church lane, Boston.  
 Snow, Elizabeth, Barnstaple, Corset Maker. July 11 at 11 at offices of Thorne, Castle st., Barnstaple.  
 Nohrensen, Charles, Swansea, Grocer. July 7 at 11 at offices of Thomas, York place, Swansea.  
 Stanfield, William, Todmorden, York, Bootmaker. July 11 at 11 at offices of Rottonley, New st., Huddersfield.  
 Stanton, Benjamin, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer. July 6 at 3 at offices of Shoosmith, Newland, Northampton.  
 Steep, John, Falingworth, Lincoln, Farmer. July 11 at 11 at offices of Chambers, Market Rasen.  
 Stevenson, David, Leeds, Tailor. July 11 at 2 at offices of Roos and Midgley, White Horse st., Boat lane, Leeds.  
 Turner, Ashton, Chesterfield, Auctioneer. July 10 at 11 at offices of Cowell, High st., Chesterfield.  
 Upton, Edward Joseph, Hastings, Grocer. July 9 at 12 at 4, Arthur st. east, Jones, Hastings.  
 Warburton, Frederick Tynte, Tenby, Pembroke, Major in Her Majesty's Land Forces. July 9 at 2 at the Gaithall, Carmarthen. Gwynne and Stokes, Tenby.  
 Watkins, Thomas Davis, Bristol, Innkeeper. July 7 at 12 at offices of Clifton, Corn st., Bristol.

Wells, John Calvin, Liverpool, Sewing Machine Dealer. July 7 at 11 at offices of Rowlands, Ann st., Birmingham.  
 Weston, Albert, Bristol, Coal Merchant. July 11 at 12 at offices of Beckington, Albion chamber, Broad st., Bristol.  
 Wetherill, William Thomas, Over Darwen, Cotton Manufacturer. July 6 at 3 at offices of Smith and Garnett, Booth st., Manchester.  
 Dean, Preston.  
 White, Henry, Freshwater, Romford, Builder. July 6 at 3 at the Red Lion Hotel, Romford. Brown, Basinghall st.  
 Wilcox, William, Upper Berkeley st., Portman sq., Lodging House Keeper. July 20 at 4 at Ridder's Hotel, Holborn, Yorks, Marylebone rd.  
 Williams, Joseph Stephen, Bristol, Tailor. July 10 at 2 at offices of Williams and Co., Exchange, Bristol.

## CAVE CANEM.

## POMPEIAN DOOR MATS.

## TRELOAR AND SONS,

## 69, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON, E.C.

The celebrated and very valuable Freehold fully-licensed Public-house situate at the top of the Haymarket, at the corner of Cove-try-street and Great Windmill-street, and known as the Wilton (Scott's), let on lease at an exceedingly low rental, and offering to trustees, capitalists, brewers, and the trade a thoroughly safe and profitable investment.—In the High Court of Justice, Chancery Divis on : Cook v. Day.

**WEATHERALL & GREEN** will SELL, by AUCTION, at the Mart, near the Bank of England, on TUESDAY, JULY 3, at ONE o'clock, in one Lot (by direction of his Lordship the Master of the Rolls), the important and very valuable FREEHOLD PROPERTY, well known as the Wilton (Scott's), comprising the houses No. 20, Coventry-street, and No. 2, Great Windmill-street, immediately opposite the Haymarket, and one of the finest positions at the West-end. It is now let on lease to a most responsible tenant at the exceedingly low rental of £600 a year, which may be considered merely a ground-rent, as, irrespective of the rental value of the property, it possesses in addition the security of the present large and increasing very profitable trade, which, on the expiration of the present lease, will of necessity command an adequate premium for a renewed term. The premises are of a most substantial character, and decorated in a superior and tasty manner. The bar has six entrances, and is especially arranged to meet the requirements of the trade, and the domestic accommodation is particularly adapted for a large establishment.

May be viewed by permission of the tenant, and particulars obtained at the Mart; or of Messrs. WEATHERALL & GREEN, Auctioneers, 22, Chancery-lane; or

Messrs. BARNARD & SON, 8, Lancaster-place, Strand; or  
 Messrs. M. & F. DAVIDSON & BURCH, Solicitors, 35, Spring-gardens; and of  
 EUSTACE W. OWLES, Esq., Solicitor, No. 22, Chancery-lane.

**DIRECT CONTINENTAL STEAM PASSENGER SERVICE.**—The GENERAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY'S STEAM SHIPS leave Irongate and St. Katharine's Wharf, near the Tower, for

HAMBURG.—Every Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday, and Sunday. July 3rd at 9; 5th and 7th, at 10 a.m. Fares: Saloon, £2 10s.; fore cabin, £1 9s. Return tickets: Saloon, £3 6s.; fore cabin, £2 4s.

ANTWERP.—Every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, at noon. Fares: Saloon, £1 4s.; fore cabin, 16s. Return tickets: Saloon, £1 7s.; fore cabin, £1 4s. 6d.

OSTEND.—Every Wednesday and Saturday. July 4th, at 6 p.m.; 7th at 9 a.m. Fares: Saloon, 18s.; fore cabin, 16s. Return tickets: Saloon, £1 7s. 6d.; fore cabin, £1 1s.

BOULOGNE.—July 1st, at 3 a.m.; 2nd, at 4 p.m.; 3rd, at 5; 4th, at 6; 5th, at 7; 6th, at 8; 7th, at 10 a.m. and 10 p.m. Fares: Saloon, 18s.; fore cabin, 8s. 6d. Return tickets: Saloon, 18s. 6d.; fore cabin, 13s.

HAVRE.—Every Thursday. July 5th, at 10 a.m. Fares: Saloon, 18s.; fore cabin, 9s. Return tickets: Saloon, 20s. 6d.; fore cabin, 14s.

BORDEAUX.—Wednesday, July 4th, at 9 a.m. Fares: Saloon, 23. Passengers must obtain their tickets at the Chief Office, 71, Lombard-street, on the day preceding.

A steam tender conveys passengers, free of charge, to and from the ships when necessary. Sowards' fees are included in the fares.

For full particulars of through service, see bills, or apply to the Company's agents at the towns named; or to the Chief Offices, 71, Lombard-street, and 37, Regent-circus, Piccadilly.

The Company undertake all shipping and delivery business in London in connection with goods to be loaded in or discharged from their vessels, and make through rates, including all charges between all ports to which the vessels trade.—For particulars apply to the SECRETARY.

**THE LONDON ASSURANCE CORPORATION,  
FOR FIRE, LIFE, AND MARINE ASSURANCES.**

(Incorporated by Royal Charter, A.D. 1720.)  
Office:—No. 7, ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON, E.C.  
WEST-END AGENTS:  
MESSRS. GRINDLAY & CO., 55, PARLIAMENT-STREET, S.W.

Governor—EDWARD BUDD, Esq.  
Sub-Governor—MARC WILKS COLLET, Esq.  
Deputy-Governor—WILLIAM RENNIE, Esq.

Directors.

M. Gough Arburghot, Esq.	A. C. Guthrie, Esq.
Robert Burn Blyth, Esq.	Louis Hurn, Esq.
William T. Brand, Esq.	Henry J. B. Kendall, Esq.
Major-General H. P. Burn.	Charles Ly H. Esq.
George W. Campbell, Esq.	Capt. R. W. Peiry, R.N.
George B. Dowhurst, Esq.	David Powell, Esq.
Robert B. Dobres, Esq.	P. F. Robertson, Esq.
George L. M. Gibbs, Esq.	Robert Ryrie, Esq.
Robert Gillespie, Esq.	David P. Waller, Esq.
Howard Gilliat, Esq.	Col. Leopold Seymour.
Henry Goschen, Esq.	Lewis A. Wallace, Esq.
Edwin Gower, Esq.	William B. Watson, Esq.

Solicitors.

MESSRS. JOHNSON, UPTON, BUDD, &  
ATKEY, 20, ANTIQUEIERS.

FIRE DEPARTMENT.

NOTICE is hereby given to persons assured against Fire, that the renewal receipts for Premiums due at Midsummer are ready to be delivered, and that Assurances on which the Premium shall remain unpaid after Fifteen Days from the said Quarter-day will become void. Fire Assurances can be effected with the Corporation at moderate rates of Premium.

LIFE DEPARTMENT.

Life Assurances may be effected either with or without participation in profits.

Copies of the Actuary's Report on the quinquennial valuation to the 31st December, 1875, also of the Accounts, pursuant to "The Life Assurance Companies Act, 1870," may be obtained on application.

The Directors are ready to receive applications for Agencies to the Corporation.

JOHN P. LAURENCE, Secretary.

**GUARDIAN FIRE AND LIFE OFFICE.**

11, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON, E.C.  
Established 1821. Subscribed Capital, Two Millions.

DIRECTORS.

CHAIRMAN—G. J. Shaw Lefevre, Esq., M.P.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—Richard M. Harvey, Esq.

Henry Huise Berens, Esq.	Rt. Hon. John G. Hubbard, M.P.
Frederick Wm. Bonham-Carter, Esq.	Frederick H. Janson, Esq.
Charles Wm. Curtis, Esq.	Beaumont W. Lubbock, Esq.
Charles F. Davys, Esq.	John B. Martin, Esq.
Sir Walter R. Farquhar, Bart.	Hy. John Norman, Esq.
Alban G. H. Gibbs, Esq.	Augustus Prevost, Esq.
James Goodson, Esq.	William Steven, Esq.
Archibald Hamilton, Esq.	John G. Talbot, Esq., M.P.
Thomson Hankey, Esq., M.P.	Henry Vigne, Esq.

MANAGER OF FIRE DEPARTMENT—F. J. Marsden.

ACTUARY AND SECRETARY—T. G. C. Browne.

Share Capital at present paid up and invested ... £1,000,000  
Total Funds ... £2,961,000  
Total Annual Income upwards of ... £440,000

N.B.—Fire Policies which expire at Midsummer should be renewed at the Head Office, or with the Agents, on or before the 9th of July.

**LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY.**

24, LINCOLN'S-INN-FIELDS, W.C.

CHAIRMAN—Alfred H. Shadwell, Esq.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—H. Cecil Balkes, Esq., M.P.

Reversions and Life Interests purchased. Immediate and Deferred Annuities granted in exchange for Reversionary and Contingent Interests.

Loans may also be obtained on the security of Reversions.

Annuities, Immediate, Deferred, and Contingent, and also Endowments granted on favourable terms.

Prospectuses and Forms of Proposal, and all further information, may be had at the office.

C. B. CLABON, Secretary.

**REVERSIONARY AND LIFE INTERESTS IN LANDED OR FUNDED PROPERTY OR OTHER SECURITIES AND ANNUITIES PURCHASED, OR LOANS THEREON GRANTED, BY THE**

**EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY**  
10, LANCASTER-PLACE, WATERLOO-BRIDGE, STRAND.

Established 1835. Paid-up Capital, £250,000.

If required Interest on Loans may be capitalized.

J. S. CLAYTON, } Joint  
C. H. CLAYTON, } Secretaries.

**ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY**  
(Limited), 7, BANK-BUILDINGS, LITHBURY, E.C.  
General Accidents. | Personal Injuries.  
Railway Accidents. | Death by Accidents.  
C. HARDING, Manager.

**THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED).**  
Established in 1853.—Cap. £1,000,000  
HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON.  
BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kerrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms customary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:—At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' notice of withdrawal. For shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

Bills issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent for collection.

SALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realized. Every other description of banking business and money at a/c, British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

**EDE AND SON**

**ROBE**



**MAKERS**

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

**SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.**

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

**CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS**  
ESTABLISHED 1689.

**94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.**

**PAINLESS DENTISTRY.**

M.R. G. H. JONES,

SURGEON DENTIST,

57, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, LONDON

(Immediately opposite the British Museum),

Has obtained Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent for his perfectly painless system of adapting

(Prize Medal, London and Paris)

ARTIFICIAL TEETH BY ATMOSPHERIC PRESSURE.

Pamphlet gratis and Post-free.

**PARTRIDGE & COOPER.**

**WHOLESALE AND RETAIL STATIONERS**

192, Fleet-street, and 1 & 2, Chancery-lane, London, E.C.

CARRIAGE PAID TO THE COUNTRY ON ORDERS EXCEEDING 20s.

DRAFT PAPER, 5s., 6s., 6d., 7s., 9d., and 9s. 9d. per ream.

BRIEF PAPER, 15s., 6d., 17s., 6d., and 23s., 6d. per ream.

FOOLSCAP PAPER, 10s., 6d., 14s., 6d., and 18s., 6d. per ream.

CREAM-LAIN NOTE, 3s., 4s., and 5s. per ream.

LARGE CREAM-LAIN NOTE, 4s., 6d., 6s., 6d., and 9s. per ream.

LARGE BLUE NOTE, 3s., 6d., 4s., 6d., and 6s., 6d. per ream.

ENVENLOPES, CREAM OR BLUE, 3s., 9d., 4s., 6d., and 6s., 6d. per 1000.

THE "TEMPLE" ENVELOPE, EXTRA SECURE, 9s., 6d. per 1000.

FOOLSCAP OFFICIAL ENVELOPES, 1s., 9d. per 100.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM WOVE CLUB-HOUSE NOTE, 9s., 6d. per ream. This incomparable paper has raised us a host of worthless imitations. Purchasers are particularly requested to observe that each sheet bears the fac-simile water-mark, "PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM-WOVE CLUB-HOUSE PAPER," without which none is genuine.

INDENTURE SKINS, PRINTED AND MACHANE RULED, 2s., 3d. EACH, 25s. PER DOZ., 185s. PER ROLL.

SECONDS OR FOLLOWERS, RULED, 2s., 1d. EACH, 24s. PER DOZEN, 115s. PER ROLL.

RECORDS OR MEMORIALS, 8d. EACH, 7s., 6d. PER DOZEN.

LEDGERS, DAY BOOKS, CASH BOOKS, LETTER OR MINUTE BOOKS.

An immense stock in various bindings.

**PEARL'S TRANSPARENT SOAP.**

FOR THE

**TOILET, NURSERY, & SHAVING.**

"An article of the neatest and most careful manufacture, and one of the most refreshing and agreeable of balms to the skin."—

MR. ERASMIUS WILSON, F.R.S.

Vide "Journal of Cutaneous Medicine."

Sold by Chemists and Perfumers everywhere.

